HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLV JANUARY, 1952 NUMBER 1

A. E. HOUSMAN ON THE LETTER TO DIOGNETUS VII 2

[Many years ago I wrote to ask Professor Housman the meaning of *τὰ ἄστρα τῷ τῆς σελήνης ἀκολουθοῦντα δρόμῳ*, the 'stars as they follow the course of the moon,' in this passage. The point is not explained in H. G. Meecham's excellent edition and I am deeply grateful to Mr. Laurence Housman for his kind permission to publish what his brother wrote in reply to the enquiry.]

Trinity College
27 Jan. 1926

Dear Nock,

To say seriously that the stars follow the moon's course is of course absurd, as they move in the opposite direction; so I surmise that this is an ornate expansion of Genesis I 16, that the Moon is confused with Night (they both ride in a coach and pair) as in Ovid fast. VI 235 and Luc. I 218, and that then one may compare Eur. Ion 1151 *ἄστρα δ' ὠμάρτει θεᾷ*, Theocr. II 166, Tibull. II 1 87 sq.

Yours sincerely
A. E. Housman

If the moon's *δρόμος* is her visible motion from her rising in the east to her setting in the west, then the herd of stars may seem to be following a great leader, if the observer is not sharp enough to notice that they are always overtaking her.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/harvard-theological-review_1952-01_45_1

THE BIBLE IN PERSIAN TRANSLATION

A Contribution to the History of Bible Translations in Persia and India

WALTER J. FISCHEL
University of California, Berkeley

I

Introduction

The history of Persia from its very beginning until today, from Cyrus the Great to Riza Khan Pehlevi — a history covering twenty-five centuries equally divided by the Arab conquest of the year 642 into a pre-Islamic and an Islamic period — has seen an uninterrupted and continuous association between Iran and Israel. Jews have been living on Iran's soil from the dawn of the first Persian empire on, as an inseparable part of Iran's national destiny and development. Jews were the eye-witnesses of all the historical events in Persia under every dynasty — the Achaemenids, Parthians and Sassanids, the Omayyads and the Abbasids, the Seljuks, Mongols, Safavids, and Kajars, under every ruler, Caliph, Sultan, Il-Khan, Emir or Shah. Jews were the contemporaries of all the manifold religious movements and sects that were born on Persian soil, such as Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism, Shi'a, Sufism, Bahaism; they were companions of the great classical poets, of a Firdūsī, Ḥāfiz, Sa'adī, Jāmī, and of all the other great Persian masters of art, literature and philosophy who made their everlasting contributions to world culture.

Did this centuries-long association between Israel and Iran produce any literary works of permanent value and, in particular, did this association bring about a translation of the Bible into the Persian language by either Jewish or Muslim scholars in Persia? [1]

[1] The history of the translations of the Bible into various European and Oriental languages throughout the centuries has long been investigated. A historical survey of the translations of the Bible into the Persian language, however, has thus far been neglected. The following study attempts to outline only the major phases in this field.

The pre-Islamic period of the Jewish-Persian relationship yields no evidence on which a positive answer in this respect could be based. The discussion in Talmudic literature of the use in the synagogue of Bible copies in foreign characters, in transliteration or in translation [2] — especially the question of the reading of the Book of Esther in Greek, Coptic, Elamite or Median — may allude to the once existence of such translated or transliterated biblical books.[3] On the other hand, the numerous biblical quotations in Pehlevi literature, especially in the polemic works called "Dinkard" and "Shikand" [4] may suggest an existing translation in Pehlevi. The assertion of Theodoret, the Syrian bishop of the fifth century, that there existed an old Persian translation of the Bible, or the view of Maimonides that an old Persian translation was extant long before Islam, cannot be substantiated; in any event, no record of such a translation has come down to us.[5]

A perusal of the early classical Persian poetry in the Islamic period may create the impression that, along with the ancient Persian tradition, it was the Bible which stood godfather at the very birth of the neo-Persian literature. Indeed, the manifold references to biblical figures and heroes, to Moses, Joseph, Suleiman (Jamshid) and to biblical motifs and symbols in the classical Persian poetry, and even in the pictorial representation of Persian Muslim art and miniature,[6] may well lead to this impression. The biblical element is particularly evident in Firdūsī's romantic religious epos "Yūsuf and Zulaikhā," which became one of the most popular themes in Persian poetry.[7]

[2] B. Talmud Shabbat 115a; b. Talmud Megilla 18a; b. Talmud Sota 49b; Massekhet Soferim I, 7.8.

[3] L. Blau, "Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift," Berlin, 1894.

[4] See P. Jean de Menasce, "Škand-Gumānīk Vičār, Une apologétique Mazdéenne du IX[e] siècle," (Collectanea Friburgensia n.s., Fasc. XXX), Fribourg, 1945; J. Darmesteter, Textes pehlvis relatifs au judaisme, in Revue des Études juives (= REJ), Paris, 1889, vol. 18, pp. 1–15; vol. 19, pp. 41–53; L. H. Gray, "The Jews in Pahlavi Literature" in Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, 1905, vol. 9, pp. 462–465.

[5] L. Zunz, "Gesammelte Schriften," Berlin, 1876, vol. III, pp. 136; W. Bacher, Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. III, p. 190; W. J. Fischel, Encyclopedia Judaica, Berlin, 1937, vol. IX, col. 557–568.

[6] Th. Arnold, "The Old and New Testament in Muslim Religious Art," London, 1928.

[7] See Th. Noeldeke, "Das iranische Nationalepos" (Grundriss d. iran Philol., Strassbourg, 1896–1904, vol. II, pp. 130–211; E. G. Browne, "A Literary History

It is clear, however, that despite the fact that Iranian and biblical-Semitic elements were blended in many of the works of classical Persian poetry,[8] and that the Bible became an inseparable part of Persian literature, the Persian authors had no first-hand knowledge of the Bible and hardly grasped the real significance and basic teachings of Judaism. Limited as it was, they derived their biblical knowledge neither from the original nor even from a Persian translation, but primarily through the channel and medium of the Koran and the Islamic legend and tradition.

If we examine the theological and historical literature of the early Islamic centuries produced by Persian scholars in Arabic or Persian we must come to the same conclusion that although they sometimes used Hebrew quotations from the Bible and manifested a certain acquaintance with the Bible and Judaism, mainly due to a close coöperation with Jewish or Christian scholars, no Bible translation into Persian was known or used by them.[9]

II

The Pentateuch Translation of Jacob ben Tavus (1546)

The first Persian translation of the Pentateuch became known only in the sixteenth century and represents a Judaeo-Persian translation, that is, a Persian translation written in Hebrew characters. It was published in 1546 in Constantinople as part of a Jewish polyglot Bible, printed by Eleazar ben Gerson Soncino, and contained, side by side with the Hebrew original, the Targum, the Arabic version of Sa'adia Gaon, and a Judaeo-Persian translation of the Pentateuch in Hebrew characters.[10] The author of

of Persia," London, 1909, vol. I, p. 9, and 479; M. Gruenbaum, "Neue Beitraege zur semit. Sagenkunde," Leyden, 1893, pp. 148–240; and his "Juedische Elemente in Firdusi" in Zeitschrift der Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft (= ZDMG), Jena, 1888, vol. 43, pp. 1–29; pp. 445–477.

[8] See J. Horovitz "Hebrew-Iranian Synchronism" in Oriental Studies in honor of C. E. Pavry, Oxford, 1933, pp. 151–155.

[9] See the works of Muslim scholars of Persian origin such as Hamza al-Isfahānī (c. 971); al-Kirmānī (d. 1013); al-Birūnī (d. 1048); Abu'l-Ma'ālī (d. 1092); ash-Shahrastānī (d. 1153); al-Murtaḍā (d. 13th century). See W. Bacher: "Bibel und biblische Geschichte in der muhammedanischen Literatur" in "Jeschurun," ed. J. Kobak, Breslau, 1871, vol. 8, pp. 1–30; I. Goldziher: "Ueber muhammedanische Polemik gegen Ahl al-Kitāb," ZDMG, 1898, vol. 32, pp. 341–387.

[10] Alexander Kohut was the first scholar who made a thorough investigation of this Tavus Pentateuch translation, in "Kristische Beleuchtung der Persischen

this Judaeo-Persian translation was Jacob b. Josef Tavus,[11] a Jewish scholar from Persia,[12] who apparently functioned as a teacher at the Jewish Academy in Constantinople, established by the Jewish physician of the Ottoman Sultan Suleiman, Moses Hamon (1490–1576).[13]

This Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch translation, however, remained rather unnoticed at the time,[14] and only when, over a century later, in 1657, the Tavus Pentateuch version was transliterated from its Hebrew characters into Persian characters by Thomas Hyde, and incorporated into the famous London Polyglot Bible

---

Pentateuch-Uebersetzung des Jacob ben Joseph Tavus, unter stetiger Rücksichtnahme auf die aeltesten Bibelversionen." Leipzig, 1871.

Kohut did not earn much gratitude from his contemporary colleagues. A. Geiger (who does not even mention the Tavus version in his "Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel," Breslau, 1857) criticized Kohut heavily in his "Juedische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben," Berlin, 1872, pp. 103–113. In speaking of the Judaeo-Persian literature he states: "This terrain remains sterile even if one adds any amount to make it fertile."

Even de Lagarde in "Symmicta," Göttingen, 1877–80, Vol. II, p. 14, discards Kohut's extensive analysis on Tavus and remarks that "the size of his book does not stand in proportion to the value. . . ." Indeed, additional research and new discoveries of ancient manuscripts in recent decades have made Kohut's work obsolete.

[11] Concerning Jacob b. Tavus see J. Le Long, "Discours historique sur les principales éditions des Bibles Polyglottes," Paris, 1713, pp. 39–42, 214, 215; Rosenmüller, "de Versione Pentateuchi Persica Commentatio," Lipsae, 1813, p. 4, who had erroneously assumed that Tavus lived in the ninth century; J. Chr. Wolff, Bibliotheca Hebraea, Hamburg, 1715, Vol. 1, p. 597, No. 1057; G. B. De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, Parma, 1802, Vol. 2, p. 146; S. Munk, "Notice sur R. Saadja Gaon et sa version arabe d'Isaie et sur une version persane manuscrite de la Bibl. Royale," Paris, 1838, in S. Cahen, "La Bible," Vol. IX, pp. 134–159.

[12] About the historical circumstances which brought Jacob ben Tavus from Persia to Constantinople during the Turkish-Persian wars in 1535 see Moses di Rossi's letter, ed. Kaufmann, Jewish Quarterly Review (= JQR), Vol. 9, 1897, p. 498, and L. Bouvat, "Essai sur les rapports de la Perse avec l'Europe" in "Revue du Monde Musulman," Paris, 1921, Vol. 46, pp. 64–68.

[13] About the physician of Suleiman, Moses Hamon, see REJ, Paris, 1908, Vol. 56, pp. 12–13.

[14] The first reference in Hebrew sources to the Pentateuch version of Tavus is apparently in Asarya de Rossi, "Meor Eynayiam," ed. Wien, 1829, p. 309; see L. Zunz, "Gesammelte Schriften," Berlin, 1876, Vol. 3, p. 135.

The Constantinople Polyglot Bible became so rare that in 1783 Ch. G. Adler in his "Bibelkritische Reise nach Rom," Altona, 1783, p. 221, states: "Ich kenne nur drei Exemplare von derselben; das eine ist in der kaiserlischen Bibliothek zu Wien, das andere in De Rossi's Bibliothek zu Parma, aber ohne Titel, das dritte in der Oppenheim Bibliothek zu Hamburg."

of Bishop Bryan Walton, was an interest aroused in this new field of Persian and Jewish literature.[15]

It was long believed that this Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch translation was not only the sole literary achievement of its kind produced by Persian Jews until then, but was also the oldest and the only translation of the Pentateuch. Yet this Pentateuch version, though the first to become known and one of the first to be printed,[16] was far from opening the field of Judaeo-Persian Bible translations. It seems rather to stand at the very end of a long chain of Bible translations and represents merely the culmination of Judaeo-Persian Bible studies which had been going on for several centuries previously.

The assumption that Jews were active in translating Bible books into the Persian language centuries before Jacob b. Tavus published his version, and that the Jews in Persia cultivated the study of the Bible and its translation into Persian for many centuries, has become a sound and solid certainty, thanks to the endeavors of a remarkable personality of the sixteenth century, namely, Giambattista Vecchietti.

III

Giambattista Vecchietti (1552–1619)

1. His Life

This traveller, diplomat, and scholar, born in Cosenza in 1552, a son of a noble and aristocratic family, educated in Florence and Rome, had a very colorful career.[17] In 1584 he was entrusted by

[15] Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, edited by Brian Walton, London, 1657, Vol. IV. See Vol. I, Prolegomena, XVI, De Lingua Persica et Versionibus Scripturae Persicis, pp. 101–102; J. Le Long, "Discours historique," l.c., p. 214ff.

[16] According to S. Munk, l.c., p. 156ff. a Persian translation of the Book of Tobit was already published in 1542, with Latin translation. The Persian was, of course, used very early by Jews in Persia; about the earliest Judaeo-Persian documents, attesting to the use of modern Persian by Jews, see V. Minorsky: "Early Hebrew-Persian Documents" in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (= JRAS), London, 1942, pp. 181–194.

[17] Our main source of information about Giambattista Vecchietti's life is the biographical sketch written in the form of a letter by his brother Girolamo Vecchietti on March 26, 1620, and published by J. Morelli, in "I Codici monoscritti volgari della Libreria Naniana," Venezia, 1776, pp. 159–191.

For other valuable details on his life and activities, see Girolamo Tiraboschi "Storia della letteratura italiana," Milano, 1824, Vol. VIII, pp. 145–147; Amat

Pope Gregory XIII with a double apostolic mission to the East; he was to go, firstly, to Alexandria, Egypt, to induce the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria to join the Catholic Church, and, secondly, he was to visit the Shah of Persia in order to offer the promise of help and an alliance with the European Christian rulers in his war against the Turkish Sultan. It was during his stay in Egypt that Vecchietti began to study Persian with several teachers, as well as Arabic, which he had already learned in preparation for his second apostolic mission. His mission to Persia brought him to the court of the Persian Shah 'Abbās I, at Tabriz, where he was cordially received. Returning from there, he went via Shiraz and Ormuz [18] to Goa, India, and returned from there to Italy on a Portuguese ship in 1588.

Although requested by Pope Gregory XIV (1592) to resume his diplomatic mission to travel in the East again, Vecchietti, after a visit to the King of Spain, gave up his rôle as ambassador and diplomat and decided to travel through the East on his own, in his private capacity.[19] Thus, he spent many years in the East, especially in Persia and India. In 1604 he arrived in Agra, was received there in audience by the Mogul Emperor, Akbar the

---

di S. Filippo "Biografia dei viaggiatori italiana," Paris, 1882, pp. 335 and 355–359; also Encycl. Italiana, s.v., Vol. 34, 1937; Pietro Donazzolo, "Di una Relazione inedita di G. B. Vecchietti intorus all'Egitto" in "Ateneo Veneto," 1925, pp. 157–163. Very illuminating is the material published by G. Levi della Vida, "Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico fondo dei manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana," in "Studi e Testi"; Vatican, 1939, Vol. 92, pp. 168, 267; and also his "Documenti Intorno alle Relazioni della Chiese Orientali con la S. Sede durante il Pontificato di Gregorio XIII" in "Studi e Testi" No. 143, Vaticano, 1948, pp. 117ff.; pp. 168–171.

[18] While in Ormuz Vecchietti surveyed the political and military conditions of this island and of the Persian mainland, and wrote a confidential report which was published for the first time only in 1892. See "A Report on the Condition of Persia in the year 1586" (in Italian), published by H. F. Brown, in English Historical Review, London, 1892, Vol. 7, pp. 313–321; V. Minorsky, "Tadhkirat al-Mulūk (A Manual of Safavid Administration), E. J. W. Gibb Memorial, new series, Vol. XVI, London, 1943, pp. 4, 32, 179.

[19] His brother Girolamo succeeded him as envoy of the Pope, Clement VIII, to Egypt. About his activities see Vincenzo Buri, "L'Unione della Chiesa Copta con Roma, sotto Clemente VIII," in Orientalia Christiana, Rome, 1931, Vol. 23, No. 72, pp. 108–110, 113–134; P. Rabbath, "Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire du Christianisme en Orient," Paris, 1907. See also the letter written by Giambattista to his brother Girolamo in 1599 (April 4), published in "La Civilta Cattolica," 1930, Vol. 3, pp. 510–512.

Great.[20] Together with his brother, who had followed him, he returned from Agra to Tatta, and travelled thence via Ormuz to Bandar Abbas, Lar, Shiraz, Isfahan, and Hamadan, and then to Baghdad, where they arrived on November 22, 1606. Proceeding to Italy by sea, Giambattista Vecchietti's ship was attacked by Tunisian pirates on the Barbary coast, and Giambattista fell into captivity, remaining a prisoner for a month and a half, until he was ransomed and was able to return to Rome in 1608.

He then presented himself to the Pope but did not win his appreciation and favors, his former services being almost forgotten. After a journey to the King of Spain, at whose court he stayed for several years, Vecchietti returned to Florence in 1615, and after having visited his brother Girolamo and the Pope in Rome in 1616, he went to Naples, where, on December 8, 1619, he died in misery and poverty.

2. *Vecchietti — The First Collector of Persian Bible Manuscripts*

We are not concerned here with the adventures and experiences of Vecchietti's journeys, with his diplomatic missions or his business transactions, or with the hardships, sickness and deprivation of his travels. Only one aspect of his travels to Persia and India occupies our attention here, namely, his interest in and his collection of old Persian Bible manuscripts during his many years of journeying in the East. Of all the motives which might have animated him to go to the East, one major consideration was his enthusiasm and passion for collecting old Bible manuscripts and bringing them to Europe.

He therefore searched systematically, in all the places he visited in Persia, Lar, Shiraz, Hamadan and elsewhere, for Persian Bible versions — for manuscripts "of the divine writings in the Persian language." He succeeded, indeed, in finding them in the homes of Persian Jews who had evidently continued to cultivate their Bible studies in Persia and to translate various texts of all the books of the Old Testament from time immemorial into the Persian language. These Persian Bible versions which Vecchietti was able to acquire, however, were written not in Persian characters but, in

[20] About his meeting with Akbar the Great, see later, under §4.

accordance with the custom of the Jews, in Hebrew characters.[21]

The biographical sources pertaining to Giambattista Vecchietti speak only in a general way of the various books of the Bible which he had brought back from Persia. In order to know more specifically what books of the Bible Vecchietti was able to collect and bring to Europe, we must turn to the catalogues of the Persian manuscript collections in European libraries, especially in Paris and the Vatican, and examine the extant Persian Bible manuscripts. It becomes evident from this investigation that many of the earliest and most valuable Persian Bible versions now in Europe owe their presence and preservation to Giambattista Vecchietti.[22]

a) The Pentateuch in Judaeo-Persian translation

First of all, Vecchietti brought back from Persia a Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch translation which represents one of the oldest Judaeo-Persian versions thus far extant.

This "Pentateuchus Mosis" had a stormy history. Vecchietti acquired it in the month of May, 1606, in Lar, lost it when, on his return to Italy, he was attacked by pirates in the Mediterranean and taken as a prisoner to Tunis, and later bought the manuscript back from a "Cacam degli Hebrei" (a Jewish Chacham) for two ducats. The manuscript was afterward sent as a present to Pope Benedict XVI and added to the Vatican collection.[23]

This "Pentateuco in Persiano con caratteri Ebraici" was investigated in 1885 by I. Guidi.[24] He transliterated some chapters

[21] Morelli, pp. 167–168: "Libri della Scrittura Vecchia tradotta gia ab antiquo de quegli Ebrei, che cola si ne erano iti ad abitare, in lingua Persiana, per use delle genti loro, nel carattero Ebreo."

[22] The present writer was able, on several visits to Europe, to examine closely most of these Judaeo-Persian Bible Manuscripts in the Libraries of Rome, Paris and London.

[23] S. Assemanus: Biblioteca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticano, Roma, 1719, Vol. 1, p. 435; J. Le Long, Bibliotheca Sacra, Paris, 1723, Vol. 1, pp. 232–233; A. Maio, in Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticanis Codicibus, Vol. IV, Romae, 1831, p. 650, No. LXI; P. Horn, "Die Persischen und Türkischen Handschriften des Vatikans," ZDMG, 1897, Vol. 51, p. 7, and now Ettori Rossi, "Elenco dei Manoscritti Persiani della Biblioteca Vaticana," Roma, 1948, p. 87, No. 61.

[24] I. Guidi, "Di una versione Persiana del Pentateuco" in Rendiconti della R. Acc. dei Lincei, Roma, 1885, pp. 347–355: "Il codice vaticano proviene de Lar compratovi da G. B. Vecchietti nel tempo che sotto Abbas I . . ."; see also E. Rossi, l.c., p. 14.

of Genesis (Chap. 1:1–31; Chap. 37:3–36; Chap. 39:1–23) into Persian characters and compared it with three other ancient Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch codices in Paris,[25] St. Petersburg,[26] and the Tavus version, in order to establish date, origin and place.[27]

b) Psalms in Judaeo-Persian translation

In Shiraz, in 1601, Vecchietti obtained an ancient manuscript of the Psalms in Judaeo-Persian translation, in which only the text from the end of Psalm 58 to the end of Psalm 62 was missing and which at the time of its acquisition was about 285 years old, thus originating in the year 1316.[28] He acquired, during his stay in Lar,[29] two additional old manuscripts of the Psalms in Persian translation.

[25] About the Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch version in Paris see H. Zotenberg, Catalogues des Manuscrits Hébreux et Samaritains de la Bibliothèque Imperiale, Paris, 1866, Nos. 70–71, "a Pentateuch in Hebrew, with a Persian translation of each word in Hebrew characters different from the Tavus version." See S. Munk, l.c., above Note 11.

[26] About the Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch version in St. Petersburg, see A. Harkavy and H. L. Strack, "Catalog der Hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der Kaiserlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg," 1875, No. 141, p. 166. "Die Persische Übersetzung welche mit kleineren Buchstaben geschrieben ist und dem Grundtexte von Vers zu Vers folgt, ist von der in der Londoner Polyglotte (Bd. IV) gedruckten des Jacob Tavus verschieden."

[27] Since I. Guidi's research two other Judaeo-Persian Pentateuch versions became known.

The British Museum obtained fragments of a Hebrew-Persian Pentateuch manuscript (OR 5446) which is regarded "as perhaps the earliest Persian translation of the Pentateuch hitherto known." Its author or copyist was, according to W. Bacher (ZDMG, Vol. 47, p. 212) a certain Joseph ben Moses, who completed his translation, according to the colophon, in the year 1630 of the Seleucid calendar, meaning the year 1319 A.D. See M. Seligsohn, "The Hebrew-Persian Manuscripts of the British Museum," in JQR, o.s., Vol. 15, 1903, pp. 278–286, who reproduced only Genesis, Chap. 24:1–16. See also G. Margoliouth, "Descriptive List of Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum," London, 1893, pp. 119–120, under OR 2454.

[28] See Blochet, "Catalogue des Manuscrits persans dans la Bibliothèque Nationale," Paris, 1905, Vol. 1, p. 1, No. 1; about other translations of the Psalms into Persian though not in Hebrew characters see later; see E. Rossi, l.c., p. 72, No. 42; J. Grill, 68. Der Psalm, Tübingen, 1883, p. 225.

[29] About Lar, the place of origin of many of the Judaeo-Persian Bible manuscripts, as a cultural center and a seat of the school of Jewish scribes and copyists see the present writer's study, "The Region of the Persian Gulf and its Jewish Settlements in Islamic Times," in Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume, New York, 1950, Vol. I, pp. 203–230.

Apart from Lar, Shiraz, Ispahan and Hamadan, other Persian cities such as

c) The Prophets in Judaeo-Persian translation

From Hamadan, where he also visited the alleged tomb of Esther and Mordecai,[30] he brought back Judaeo-Persian manuscripts containing the texts of Isaiah,[31] Jeremiah, and part of Ezekiel, as well as the Book of Lamentations and the Book of Baruch.

d) The Megilloth in Judaeo-Persian translation

In addition to the Book of Lamentations which he obtained in Hamadan, he also acquired a manuscript in Lar in 1604, containing in Judaeo-Persian translation, the Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Ruth and Esther.[32]

All of these Bible manuscripts undoubtedly would have perished or fallen into oblivion had Vecchietti not rescued them.[33] These literary treasures which we owe Vecchietti tell us very convincingly of the literary activities of Persian Jews from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, and furnish definite proof (which until

---

Qum and Yezd are mentioned as seats of Jewish literary activity. A Hebrew Pentateuch manuscript with illuminations, written in 1485, in the city of Qum is preserved in Oxford (see A. Neubauer and A. Cowley: Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleiana Library, Oxford, 1906, Vol. 2, p. 228ff. No. 2814); also A. Neubauer, l.c., Vol. 1, Oxford, 1886, p. 30, No. 177.

About Yezd, see A. Marx: "Soncino Blaetter," Vol. 2, Berlin, 1927, p. 114, and E. N. Adler, Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts, Cambridge, 1921, and his "Ginze Paras u-Madai . . . The Persian Jews, their Books and Ritual." London, 1899.

[30] Vecchietti visited this holy site of the Jews several times as expressly stated in J. Morelli, l.c., p. 177.

[31] See H. Zotenberg, "Catalogue des Manuscrits Hébreux et Samaritains," l.c., No. 97, comprising the complete books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Chapters 1 to 10 of Ezekiel, published by P. de Lagarde in "Persische Studien," Göttingen, 1884; see also A. Neubauer and R. S. Driver, "The 53rd Chapter of Isaiah according to Jewish Interpreters," Oxford, 1877, Vol. 2, pp. 137–238.

[32] See Zotenberg, Cat. l.c., No. 117, containing Song of Songs, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes. On the basis of this manuscript K. D. Hassler published his "Nachricht von einer bisher noch unbekannten unmittelbaren persischen Uebersetzung der salomonischen Schriften" (Song of Songs, 1:1–8), published in "Theologische Studien und Kritiken," Vol. II, 1829, pp. 469–480; see also the remarks of Lagarde in "Persische Studien," Göttingen, 1884, p. 68.

M. Schwab referred to the study of Zotenberg's manuscript No. 117 in his article "Une Version persane de la Bible" in R.E.J., Paris, 1909, Vol. 58, pp. 303–306.

[33] They were indeed in danger of being lost altogether when Vecchietti was taken prisoner by pirates in the Mediterranean. It was due to the efforts of his brother Girolamo that he was ransomed, together with "those books of the greatest importance of the divine writings in the Persian language which he in so many years and with so much trouble had collected. . . ." See Morelli, l.c., p. 184.

then could not have been substantiated from any other source) that Persian Jews were at an early period [34] engaged in cultivating their own heritage and in translating into the Persian language books of their Bible long before Jacob ben Tavus published his Persian Pentateuch version.[35]

Although the preservation and saving of these manuscripts [36] constituted a great contribution in the field of Bible studies, Vecchietti's goal was a much higher one. Not being satisfied with the mere collection of those ancient Bible manuscripts, he intended to transliterate the Hebrew characters of these Bible manuscripts into Persian characters.

[34] At what exact time the Persian Jews started to occupy themselves with Bible translations cannot yet be established. This question can be answered only on the basis of a future comparative study of all available Judaeo-Persian Bible manuscripts. But it can be assumed that in view of the uniformity of style, the general use of Aramaisms and the choice of the same Persian equivalents, the version of Tavus, Vecchietti's manuscripts and other early texts may belong, if not to the same translator, at least to one and the same school of translators.

As to the question of origin, place and date, S. Munk's careful statement is still valid today. "Que les versions ont été faites dans la seconde moitié du 13. siècle . . . quoique je ne puisse alléguer pour cela des preuves bien rigoureuses. Mais on peut dire avec certitude que les versions ne sont ni antérieures au 13. ni postérieures au 14. siècle." (S. Munk, l.c., p. 139.)

[35] These activities led also to the translation into Persian of all the other books of the Bible, and European libraries acquired after the time of Vecchietti, Judaeo-Persian manuscripts of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Minor Prophets, Job, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, etc., and even Apocryphal books such as Tobit, Judith, Bel and the Dragon, Daniel Apocalypse, Megillat Antiochus and others — all in Hebrew characters.

See the Mss. collection of G. B. de Rossi, Bibl. Mss. Codices Hebraici, Parmae, 1803, Vol. III, pp. 59–60, 167–168; and foremost, Zotenberg, Catalogue des Manuscrits Hébreux l.c. (s.v. Nos. 90, 91, 97, 100, 101, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 127, 128, 129, 130, 142). No. 128, containing a Daniel Apocalypse, was analyzed by Zotenberg in Merx Archiv f. d. wissenschaftl. Erforschung d. Alten Testaments 1869, Vol. I, pp. 385–427; see also J. Darmesteter, "L'apocalypse persane de Daniel," in Mélanges Reinier, Paris, 1886, and R. Levy, "Daniel Nama" (in Jewish Studies in memory of G. A. Kohut, New York, 1935, pp. 423–428).

[36] He also brought back a unique manuscript in Persian characters and language, entitled "Lughat-i Furs" by Abū Manṣūr 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Asadī aṭ-Ṭūsī, a lexicon of the Persian language, pertaining to the dialect of Balkh and Khorasan, composed in 733 H. About Asadī see Encycl. of Islam, s.v.; also P. Horn, in "Abhandlungen der Königl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. Göttingen, Vol. I, No. 8, 1897, pp. 1–37. This manuscript was obtained by Vecchietti in Ormuz in 1602 and was later given as a present to Pope Benedict XIV; it is now in the library of the Vatican; see E. Rossi, "Elenco dei Manoscritti, l.c., pp. 49–51; also the references to it in A. Maio, l.c., Vol. 4, No. XXII, pp. 640–641; P. Horn, ZDMG, 1897, Vol. 51, No. 37; Levi della Vida, Ricerche l.c., pp. 167–168.

An edition of "Lughat-i Furs" was published by Abbas Iqbal, Teheran, 1919.

3. Vecchietti — the Transliterator of Persian Bible Manuscripts

Attention must be drawn to the fact that although the Jews in Islamic countries learned the language of their neighbors, whether Persian, Arabic or Turkish, they never completely surrendered to these languages. Jews in the Islamic world would not adopt the alphabet of their neighbors. Whatever they wrote in the Persian language, or in literary works of poetry or prose, they wrote exclusively in Hebrew characters. Jews regarded the Hebrew characters as such an integral part of their religious and national heritage that the use of a foreign alphabet and one of a religiously different group would have been considered as a sign of conversion, an act of betrayal — yes, a breach of religious loyalty.

Thus, Persian Jews deliberately excluded themselves from Persian literature in general and maintained a graphic independence with their Hebrew script — however complete their assimilation to the language of their neighbors may otherwise have been. It was probably this refusal of the Jews to employ the Arabic alphabet which made Judaeo-Persian literature in all its manifestations a kind of literary Ghetto, removed from general Persian literature; and this explains why in the annals of Persian literature Judaeo-Persian productions have remained unnoticed and unknown.

In view of this fact that the Persian translations of those Bible manuscripts were written exclusively in Hebrew characters and therefore not usable for wider circles, Vecchietti was determined to create, on the basis of these manuscripts, a real and reliable translation of the Bible into Persian by transliterating the Hebrew characters of the Persian manuscripts into Persian characters, thus laying the foundation for a complete translation of the Bible into Persian. He regarded this task as his particular mission and "undertook this great work in the certainty that it would please the Lord who had given him the gift of that language and it would be beneficial for the people." [37]

Thus the first European *collector* of Judaeo-Persian Bible manuscripts became also their first *transliterator*. In Ormuz,

[37] Morelli, l.c., p. 184.

where he stayed from October 3, 1600 to May 12, 1601, he transliterated the Psalms into Persian, and in Agra, the residence of the Mogul Emperor Akbar, he transliterated the various Megilloth (which he had acquired in Lar in 1604); and in Hamadan, in 1606, he carried out the transliteration of the Books of the Prophets. He planned to stay in Isfahan until the whole transliteration of the Bible could be brought to an end, which he believed could be accomplished in three years.[38] He did not, however, carry out that intention, so that the Pentateuch manuscript he had acquired could not be transliterated by him.

About the *method* of his transliteration we obtain some highly interesting details from the colophon of the manuscripts. Vecchietti expressly states concerning the transliteration of the Psalms, that he carried out this transliteration on the basis of the three manuscripts he acquired in Shiraz and Lar, "with the help and coöperation of several Hebrew and Persian teachers in Ormuz." [39] He studied Hebrew on the island of Ormuz with some Jewish Rabbis,[40] and after having acquired the necessary reading knowledge of Hebrew,[41] he dictated from the Hebrew-written Persian text of the Psalms to a Persian copyist by the name of Shams ad-Dīn Khanjī,[42] a Christian, who faithfully wrote down

[38] It is reported that "in Isfahan Vecchietti had taken a house next to that where the Fathers of Saint Augustine lived, who greatly persuaded him to continue the work he had undertaken and about which he wrote to the Pope and to many Cardinals." Morelli, l.c., p. 175.

[39] The colophon to the manuscript of the Psalm translation, written in Italian by Vecchietti, contains many details about Vecchietti's methods of translation. See Blochet Catalogue, l.c., Vol. 1, p. 1, No. 1, and Note 28 above.

[40] This adds further proof to our assumption that at that time (1601) there was a Jewish community in existence in Ormuz. See the present writer's "The Region of the Persian Gulf and its Jewish Settlements in Islamic Times," in Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume, New York, 1950, p. 216ff., and his "New Sources for the History of the Jewish Diaspora in Asia in the Sixteenth Century," in JQR, April, 1950, pp. 379–399.

[41] Vecchietti states that the Hebrew teacher did not know how to read Persian (probably in Persian characters) and that he (Vecchietti) did not at first know Hebrew, but "after I learned it everything became easy and plain . . . and I have learned more with this work on the Psalms than I have until then." See Colophon to Manuscript No. 1, in Blochet's Catalogue, l.c., fols. 248–249.

[42] Shams ad-Dīn Khanjī mentions that this manuscript is the result of what Giambattista Vecchietti, "the Frank," had dictated to him. After his return from Persia Vecchietti had shown this Persian Psalm manuscript to the Pope, but did not give it to the Vatican Library. It came into the possession of the French scholar,

the Persian words in Persian characters as dictated by Vecchietti. It is expressly stated that this translation was made "without addition or omission, without changing even one small word on our initiative, except in the matter of the Persian orthography, inasmuch as the Persian of the text was written in Hebrew characters and the orthography of one character (in Hebrew) did not entirely match the other (in Persian)."

Vecchietti experienced particular difficulty in this task, due to the presence of many old and rare Persian words in these Hebrew Persian Manuscripts "which today are little understood, taken from the oldest Persian poets, such as Firdūsī, Azraqī, and others." [43]

The manuscript containing the Major prophets [44] also was

E. Renaudot, and later of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. It carries the note, "Portata delle Persia da G. B. Vecchietti." See E. Renaudot, "Bibl. Orient," pp. 196–197, and Blochet, Catalogue, l.c., Vol. 1, p. 1.

[43] It is just this archaic flavor of the vocabulary in these old Judaeo-Persian texts, as properly observed by Vecchietti, their ancient phonetic, lexical and grammatical forms, the retention and conservation of many old words and forms of the Persian language not to be found in the oldest Persian documents, the strange combination and amalgamation of Semitic and Indo-European linguistic elements, which have made these Judaeo-Persian Bible texts a rich and important source for the Iranian lexicography. The systematic utilization of these products will undoubtedly continue to yield important results for Persian philology. This has been recognized by Semitists and Iranists, particularly by Paul de Lagarde, who stated: "From now on nobody can claim to know the Persian vocabulary who has not utilized from the very beginning to the very end these Judaeo-Persian translations." (Persische Studien, l.c., pp. 68–70.)

For further valuable remarks and observations on the Judaeo-Persian dialect see Literaturblatt f. Oriental. Philologie, Leipzig, 1884, Vol. I, pp. 186–194 (Ethé); p. 888 (Noeldeke); Vol. II, p. 74–86 and 406 (C. Salemann). H. Ethé in "Grundriss d. iran. Philologie," Vol. 2, pp. 367–368; Salemann, in "Judaeo-Persica," St. Petersbourg, 1897, p. II; Th. Noeldeke, "Judenpersisch," in Z.D.M.G., 1897, Vol. 51, pp. 669–676; W. Geiger in "Grundriss d. iran. Philologie," Vol. I, pp. 408–412, and foremost the thorough studies of W. Bacher and his still valuable survey in Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 7, pp. 313–317.

As to the modern dialect of Persian Jews see R. Abrahamian, "Dialectes des Israélites de Hamadan et d'Ispahan," Paris, 1936. A special study of the Jewish dialect of the Jews of Samarkand has been published by J. Zaroubin, Étude de la langue parlée par des Juifs de Samarkand, Leningrad, 1928. Further valuable studies, though limited in scope, are the following: Cl. Huart, "Quelques observations sur le Judeo-Persan de Bokhara, Keleti Szemla" (Revue Orientale) Budapest, 1902, Vol. 3, pp. 305–306; V. Miller, Material for the study of the Jewish-Tat language, St. Petersburg, 1892; and the studies of Morgan (Mission Scientifique en Perse) Vol. 5, 1895, on the Jewish dialect of Senne, and Zukowsky's study on the dialect of the Jews in Kashan.

[44] See Blochet, l.c., No. 4, where the book of Ezekiel is not mentioned and where Lamentations and the Book of Baruch are added to Judges and Jeremiah.

transliterated in this way, in Hamadan in 1606 with the help of Shams ad-Dīn Khandjī, according to the dictation of Vecchietti, the same copyist who had already done the transliteration of the Psalms and who had apparently accompanied Vecchietti on his travels.

According to the same procedure the Megilloth (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther and Ruth) were transliterated by Vecchietti in Agra in 1604.[45]

4. Vecchietti — in India at the Court of Akbar the Great (1604)

The visit of Vecchietti to India, to Agra, the residence of the Moghul Emperor Akbar the Great, was not surprising. Apart from the commercial interests[46] which motivated Vecchietti's journey to India it was the personality of Akbar the Great which must have attracted him. Both personalities, the Christian traveller and scholar, and the Muslim Moghul Emperor, had many common interests, particularly the same passion for the collection of holy books and their translations.

As is well known, under Akbar the Great (1542–1605) a new and most amazing chapter in the religious history of India and Asia began to unfold. Akbar, aside from being a great soldier and administrator, was also a great religious reformer who introduced a "new order" in the interconfessional relationship with his subjects. He eliminated the social and civic discriminations against non-Muslims, permitted Hindus and all other non-Muslims to build new places of worship, be it temple, pagoda, Hindu shrine, Parsee tower of silence, church or synagogue, and allowed the public celebrations of their religious festivals. He promulgated a new eclectic religion, "Tauḥīd Ilāhī," a pure theism, built a special house of worship, " 'Ibādat Khāna," near Agra, and made his court a meeting place of the leaders of all creeds who were recognized as on equal footing.[47]

[45] Blochet, l.c., No. 2 and No. 3.

[46] One of the reasons for his going to India was the desire to accumulate wealth, since he had heard during his first short visit to India, as stated in his biography, "that one could get enormously rich in India." He had already made contacts with Brahmin merchants in Cairo and he decided to try his fortune there, so that he could be well off, once and for all. He became a merchant in precious stones, spices, etc. Morelli, l.c., p. 167.

[47] About Akbar and his personality see especially V. A. Smith, "Akbar, the

Akbar had a strong passion for religious discussions and for the collecting of translations of the Holy Books of all religions. He ordered — in the words of Father Monserrate — "that on appointed days the books of all the religious laws be brought forward and that the doctors meet together and hold discussions so that I may hear them and that each one may determine which is the truest and mightiest religion." [48]

His interest in the Old and New Testament was stimulated particularly by the Jesuit missionaries, who at that time were sent to his court from Goa, in successive waves, and who succeeded to a large degree in making Christianity known in the Moghul empire.

Akbar enjoyed holy books, was intrigued by the beauty of their writing and their illuminations, and formed a library of manuscripts of considerable importance. He organized a special translation office and charged his court historian with making the translations, the Gospels being one of the first to be so ordered. Akbar was delighted to receive, in 1580, from the first Jesuit mission to his court "a copy of the Holy Bible, written in four languages, and bound handsomely in seven volumes, in Hebrew, Chaldean, Latin and Greek." [49] When he received this Bible the Jesuit missionary Monserrate reports that Akbar, "in the presence of his great nobles and religious leaders . . . most devoutly not only kissed the Bible but placed it on his head. He then asked in which volume the Gospel was to be found. When he was shown the right volume he displayed even more marked reverence for it. Then he told the priests to come with their Bibles into his own private room, where he opened the volumes once more with great reverence and joy. He shut them up again very carefully and deposited them in a beautiful book case, worthy of such sacred volumes, which stood in the same private room, where he spent a great deal of his spare time." [50]

Great Moghul," Oxford, 1919; E. Maclagan, "The Jesuits and the Great Moghul," London, 1932. See for further details the present writer's study, "Jews and Judaism at the Court of the Moghul Emperors in Medieval India," in Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, New York, 1949, pp. 137–177.

[48] Anthony Monserrate, "Mongolicae Legationes Commentarius" (1582), edited by F. Hosten and translated by J. S. Hoyland, Oxford, 1922, p. 182.

[49] Maclagan, l.c., p. 190, and Payne, "Akbar and the Jesuits," London, 1926, p. 9, 221, 242. This was very likely the royal Polyglot Bible, edited by Montanus and printed between 1569 and 1572.

[50] Monserrate, l.c., pp. 36–37.

Anxious to have Arabic and Persian translations of the Holy Books of Judaism and Christianity in his collection, Akbar wrote a letter to Philip II of Spain, in the year 1582, in which, among other things, he states: "It has been brought to our notice that the revealed books, such as the Pentateuch, the Gospel and Psalms, have been translated into Arabic and Persian. Should these books, which are profitable to all, whether translated or not, be procurable in your country, send them to me." [51]

Whether this letter — an amazing document — was answered and whether he received from Spain the requested books, is not ascertainable. In any event, Akbar did not wait and charged his court historian, Abu'l Fazl who, as expressly stated, was acquainted with the Pentateuch and Gospels, to translate the Gospels into Persian.[52] The order for the translation, in the words of the court chronicler, Badāūnī, read: "His Majesty (Akbar) firmly believed in the views of the Christian religion and wishing to spread the doctrine of Jesus . . . charged Abu'l-Fazl to translate the Gospels." [53]

No wonder that Akbar, so deeply interested in the revealed books in Persian translation, was most anxious to meet Vecchietti, the man whose reputation had spread all over the Orient, and of whom it was said: "the story of this wonderful undertaking spread from the Euphrates towards the Orient on the left side into the interior of Tartary, passing the Indus and many miles beyond the Ganges throughout the Moghul empire," and who had devoted himself as a single individual during all his travels, unsupported by any mighty potentate, to the collection of ancient Bible manuscripts and their transliteration into Persian. It is stated that Akbar awaited keenly the arrival of this "educated Frank" and inquired from the Jesuit fathers at his court, Girolamo Xavier

[51] For the full text see Rehatsek in "The Indian Antiquary," Vol. XVI, Bombay, 1887, pp. 135–139; also the important remarks on this letter by Maclagan, l.c., p. 37; p. 44, Note 57; p. 202, Note 54. This letter was reproduced by J. Frazer, "The History of Nadir Shah," London, 1742, p. 17, and also by J. Hanway, Vol. II, p. 405ff.; see later note 87.

[52] See "Khalāsat at-Tawārīkh" (Essence of History), published by H. Beveridge, JRAS, 1894, pp. 754–755.

[53] Badāūnī, "Muntakhabu't-Tawārīkh," Bibl. Indica, No. 97, Calcutta, 1924, text, Vol. II, p. 260; transl. Vol. II, p. 267.

and Diego Macchiado, whether Vecchietti had already arrived, and that "when he would come he wanted to see him." [54]

Vecchietti arrived in Agra in 1604, after he had landed in Tatta, the capital of Sind, and proceeded from there via Lahore to Delhi. A report of the memorable interview between Akbar and Vecchietti has been preserved by Vecchietti's brother,[55] who came to India in January, 1604, and joined his brother in Agra, and accompanied him part of the way back to Tatta.

In India, Vecchietti continued his activities pertaining to the Judaeo-Persian Bible manuscript. Although he could hardly have expected to find in this part of the Orient Judaeo-Persian manuscripts, even though the *lingua franca* of Moghul India was also the Persian language, it was nevertheless during his sojourn at Agra that he completed there the transliteration of the Megilloth which he had acquired in Lar in 1604 and which he had evidently taken with him to India. He dictated the transliteration into Persian characters to a Carmelite monk,[56] Daulat Khan Ṭarazi ibn Sheikh 'Abdul-Wahhāb Gwāliyārī, who wrote down every word "as dictated by Vecchietti in Persian characters without omission or addition." [57] In a letter of the Jesuit Father J. Xavier, who stayed

[54] J. Morelli, "I Codici Manoscritti," l.c., p. 168.

[55] Morelli, l.c., pp. 170–171, 186. We learn from this account that Vecchietti was most cordially received by Akbar. "He went then to pay his homage and was very cordially received by him; not content with that public visit, which took place under a 6-foot high balcony, covered by a great tent, etc. . . . he insisted that he should come in after he himself had retired, to his secret room, where only his personal entourage had access . . . He talked with him about many things, of the country he came from, of the lives of our Princes, of the journey he had undertaken, and how well he had learned the Persian language, and that he seemed to him to be a native of those parts . . .; in such a discussion most of the night went by, and when he became sleepy, on his carpet-covered bench on which he was sitting, supported on all sides by pillows, he courteously permitted him to leave, telling him that that room would always be open for him as it would be for a dear friend."

Akbar seemed to have been very intrigued by Vecchietti's personality and by his unusual knowledge of the Persian language. When Vecchietti became ill Akbar sent his own Persian doctor to him and procured for him water from the Ganges.

[56] There is no mention of this Carmelite monk in the very useful reference book by Ambrosius a S. Teresia: "Nomenclator Missionariorum Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum," Romae, 1944.

[57] It is of interest to note that Akbar's successor, Shah Jahāngīr (1605–1627) ordered the translation of the Koran into Persian, in the following words: "I told

at that time in Agra, Vecchietti's literary activities in India are confirmed as follows: [58] "While the Italian (Vecchietti) was here he copied in Persian characters the Book of Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Judith, and Esther, which he had in Persian but in the Hebrew characters and gave them to us freshly copied into the Persian tongue and character. But though the characters are new, the translation is more than 200 years old; he obtained them from some Jews in Persia at a good price." [59]

---

him to translate the Koran into plain Persian *without ornament* and *without explanation*, in simple language, word by word, *without any addition*, and that after he had completed it he should send it to the court." See Jahāngīr's Memoirs "Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī," transl. by A. Rogers, ed. by H. Beveridge, London, 1914, Oriental Translation Fund, n.s., Vol. 22, Vol. II, pp. 34–35.

[58] Maclagan, "The Jesuits and the Great Moghul," London, 1932, p. 212; also J.A.S., Bengal, 1927, pp. 111–115. Mention should be made that J. Xavier is credited with having made a translation of the Psalms into Persian, based on the Vulgate after Vecchietti's departure from India, see Sachau-Ethé "Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts," l.c., Oxford, 1889, Vol. 1, pp. 1050–57, especially No. 1828–1835.

About a Persian translation of the Gospels on the basis of an Arabic version by Xavier, see Maclagan, "The Jesuits and the Great Moghul," l.c., p. 213. See also Bulletin, School of Oriental Studies, London, 1921–23, Vol. 2, p. 532; 1923–25, Vol. 3, p. 138.

There is still lacking a complete survey of all the translations of the Gospels into Persian.

[59] Three centuries passed before another "Vecchietti," another collector of Judaeo-Persian manuscripts on a large scale appeared, in the person of the Jewish traveller and scholar Elkan N. Adler, whose travels to Persia and to Bukhara in the years 1896–97 marked a turning point in the history of the collection of Judaeo-Persian literature. Adler returned from his travels with over 100 hitherto unknown and hidden manuscripts which changed fundamentally the prevailing conception as to quantity and quality of the literary productivity of the Persian-speaking Jews.

The collection which Adler brought from Persia and Bukhara to Europe corrected also our knowledge as to the kind of Judaeo-Persian productions. Most of the manuscripts in European libraries were translations of books of the Bible or of the Apocrypha, and the impression was created that their works were mostly of a religious character. The collection of Adler, however, revealed an all-embracing literature, not only translations, but also original works, not only religious literature, but literature of secular character, poetry and prose, liturgy and philology; it showed that no sphere of literary endeavor had been neglected by Persian Jews in their own language. Though European libraries have been continuously enriched since Elkan Adler with new Judaeo-Persian manuscripts, Adler's collection has remained the most outstanding single contribution to the field. With the acquisition of this manuscript collection by the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, in 1923, this great treasure has found its home in America and will enable scholars to utilize this greatest of all Judaeo-Persian manuscript collections.

IV

A Persian Genesis Translation in Moghul India by Sarmad (ca. 1660)

Moghul India, the place where the transliteration into Persian characters of the Judaeo-Persian manuscripts of the five Megilloth was carried out by Vecchietti, became, two generations later, in the time of Akbar's grandson, Shah Jahān (1627–1658) also the soil which gave birth to the first attempt of a real Pentateuch translation into the Persian language and script.

One of the most interesting literary productions composed in the Persian language in the India of the seventeenth century, about sixty years after Akbar, is the so-called "Dābistān il-Madhāhib," "School of Religious Doctrines." [60] It is a comprehensive work, covering four hundred pages in the Persian language — a grand attempt to survey the tenets and beliefs of the five great religions, Judaism, Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Islam and Christianity, as well as the other manifold religious groups and sects of Asia. The identity of the author is not yet definitely established, though most of the scholars agree that his name was Mubād Shah, who was born in Patna at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and was originally a Parsee of the Sipasi sect.[61]

The author informs us that everything in his work on the various religions "had been received from the tongue of the Chiefs of

[60] The complete Persian text of this work was published in Calcutta in 1809. On the basis of the Calcutta text an English translation was made, though not too exact, yet most useful in view of the difficulties of the original, by David Shea and Anthony Troyer, under the title of "The Dabistan, or School of Manners," Paris, 1843, 3 vols. (Oriental Translation Fund). It was republished with a special introduction by A. V. William Jackson, in one volume, under the title "The Dabistan, or School of Manners; The Religious Beliefs, Observances, Philosophic Opinions and Social Customs of the Nations of the East," New York, 1901. For further details see the present writer's study, "Jews and Judaism at the Court of the Moghul Emperors in Medieval India," New York, 1949, p. 165ff.

[61] W. Jones regarded as the author "a Mohammedan traveller, a native of Kashmir, by the name of Mohsan Fani." Gladwin, in "New Asiatik Miscellany," Calcutta, 1789, p. 87, called him "Sheikh Mohammed Mohsin," but Vans Kennedy in his study "Notice respecting the Religion introduced into India by Akbar," in Transactions of the Literary Society, vol. 2, London, 1820, pp. 242–270, and W. Erskine in "The Authenticity of Dasatir-Dabistan," Transactions, l.c., vol. 2, pp. 342–376, had already expressed doubts as to the identity of the author as assumed by Jones.

those sects or from their books; and as to the account of the persons belonging to any particular sect the author wrote down the information which had been imparted to him by their adherents and sincere friends in such a manner that no trace of partiality or aversion might be perceived; in short, the writer of these pages performed nothing more than the office of a translator."

In this great "Handbook of Comparative Religion," as we can call it, there is also a chapter on Jews and Judaism. From whom did the Indian author derive his knowledge on this topic? From a Persian Jew from Kashan, author of Ruba'iyat, by the name of Sarmad, who turned Muslim and lived the life of a Fakīr in Delhi. This is clearly acknowledged by the author, who states that "he never happened to have intercourse with learned and distinguished men among the Yahuds; and he set no value upon what he found in the books of the foreigners about their religion. . . . But in the year of the Hejira 1057 (A.D. 1647), when I came to Hyderabad, I contracted friendship with Muḥammad Sa'īd Sarmad, who was originally from the family of learned Yahuds and of a class whom they call Rabanian (Rabbins)." [62]

This acquaintance turned into a long and fruitful association from which the author of "Dābistān" derived a great deal of inspiration. The chapter on Judaism in "Dābistān" represents the result of this intellectual coöperation with Sarmad. The author repeatedly remarks "I have heard from Sarmad" or "according to information received from the tongue of Sa'īd Sarmad."

This is not the place to investigate critically Sarmad's views on Judaism and to evaluate his concepts thereof. As a Sufi and a converted Jew, although only superficially Islamized, he was by no means the most reliable and solid source for a correct interpretation of the ideas of Judaism on God and the universe and other theological problems; yet it should be stressed that Sarmad's views show no leanings towards either Christianity or Islam. Through the medium of "Dābistān" Sarmad thus became the channel through which Jewish ideas, though with a Sufic blending, penetrated into the religious fabric of the India of his time.

The intellectual coöperation between Sarmad and the author of

[62] Dābistān, l.c., vol. 2, p. 293ff.

"Dābistān" bore other fruits. We also find incorporated in the "Dābistān" nothing less than a Persian translation of the first six chapters of Genesis under the title "The Book of Adam, which is the beginning of the Book of Moses." This astonishing fact demands an explanation. From the sources we learn that Sarmad, after his departure from Persia, arrived in Tatta, not far from the present-day Karachi, where he met a Hindu boy by the name of Abhai Khand, with whom he apparently became so infatuated that he gave up his business career and began to live the life of a dervish, of a naked fakīr — not an uncommon feature in the India of that time — preaching Sufic and mystic ideas. This Hindu boy became his disciple and Sarmad taught him Hebrew and the Old Testament. Abhai Khand came to regard himself as a Jew, as expressed in the following verses composed by him:

"I submit to Moses' law; I am of thy religion and
the guardian of thy way; I am a rabbi of the Yahuds . . ."

As a result of their joint studies, so it is reported, this Hindu began to translate the Pentateuch into classical Persian in Persian characters.[63]

The details of how this translation was carried out are not too clear. Apparently no earlier versions of Persian Pentateuch translations, such as the Pentateuch translation of Tavus of 1546, were ever used by him. It was intended to translate the whole Pentateuch, but the first six chapters of Genesis were "the only portion of the sacred books of the Jews" which was completed. It is undoubtedly due to Sarmad who, together with the author of "Dābistān," corrected and edited the translation of Abhai Khand, that its text was incorporated into the "Dābistān" and that thus was preserved the first attempt of a Pentateuch translation into the Persian language and script on Indian soil.

[63] Dābistān, l.c., vol. 2, pp. 293–299. See also J. Sarkar, "History of Aurangzib," London, 1920, vol. 3, pp. 107–113, and the important study by Maulavi Wali Khan Sahib, "A Sketch of the Life of Sarmad," in Jour. of Asiatic Soc. of Bengal, 1924, vol. 20, pp. 111–122; and the same author's study in Indian Antiquary, Bombay, vol. 39, 1910, pp. 121–122; also B. A. Hashimi, "Sarmad: His Life and Quatrains," in Islamic Culture, 1933, pp. 663–672, and 1934, pp. 102–104.

V

A Persian Psalm Translation as Ordered by Shah 'Abbās I (1618)

While these efforts towards translation or transliteration of books of the Bible were mainly the results of the private initiative, personal eagerness and desire of individual scholars or collectors, deeply interested in the Holy Books for their own sake — such as Vecchietti or Sarmad — there are manuscripts of Persian Bible translations, which owe their existence to the expressed command and official order of Muslim rulers on the Persian throne. This category of Bible translations is connected with the name of two Persian Shahs, namely, Shah 'Abbās I (1587–1629) and Nādir Shah (1734–1747).

Of all the Muslim rulers on the throne of Persia *Shah 'Abbās* I seems to have been the first who came into direct contact with the Bible.[64] Far from being antagonistic as his predecessors were towards the non-Muslims and foreigners, 'Abbās I encouraged the immigration of foreigners, non-Muslim merchants, settlers and artisans from neighboring countries such as Armenia, Georgia, Turkey, and also from Europe, and granted freedom of religion and special privileges and facilities to all those who were ready to come to his territory. It was this liberal and tolerant attitude which made Persia at that time the meeting place of European envoys, emissaries, diplomats, merchant-adventurers, missionaries — Carmelites, Jesuits, Capuchins, Augustines and others — all eager to obtain commercial, political or religious concessions and privileges.[65] Never before in the history of Persia's relationship with the outside world were the ties between Persia and Europe, economically, culturally and politically, closer.

[64] See L. Bellan, "Chah Abbas I, Sa Vie, Sa Histoire," Paris, 1933; V. Minorsky, "Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, A Manual of Safavid Administration," Facsimile with Translation and Commentary, in E. J. W. Gibb Memorial, n.s., London, 1943, Vol. VI; and the highly important work "A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia and the Papal Mission of the 17th and 18th Centuries," 2 vols., London, 1939.

[65] About Shah 'Abbās I's immigration policy and relationship to Christian Europe, see "A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia," l.c., Vol. I, pp. 71–115; also L. Bouvat, "Essai sur les rapports de la Perse avec l'Europe" in Revue du Monde Musulman, Paris, 1921, Vol. 46, pp. 23–62; and K. Bayani, "Les Relations de l'Iran avec l'Europe occidentale à l'époque Safavide," Paris, 1937.

This opening of Persia to European merchants and Christian missionaries had far-reaching consequences. It brought Persia into close contact with the Pope and the European rulers. Shah 'Abbās I acceded to the demand of the Pope to allow Christian missionaries in his realm and to freely practice the Christian religion in the hope of securing the military help of the Christian kings of Europe, for the purpose of crushing the Ottoman empire through a joint Persian-Christian alliance.[66]

The hostilities and tension between Turkey and Persia offered indeed an extraordinary chance to Catholic Christendom at that time to establish in a hitherto impenetrable Muslim country like Persia a foothold for missionary and other purposes, and in consequence of this, the Carmelite Order [67] of Italy was persuaded by Pope Clement VIII to start its missionary work, not in Palestine, as first contemplated, but in Persia.

It is this close relationship between Shi'ite Persia and European Christianity which brought about the first direct contact thus far known of a Persian Shah with the Holy Bible. When the first Carmelite priests, dispatched from Persia in order to solicit the aid of Shah 'Abbās against the Turks, reached Cracow, en route to Persia in August, 1604, the Cardinal Primate Bernard Maciejowsky of Cracow (1539–1608)[68] gave this papal mission, as a present for the Shah, a "parchment manuscript of eighty-six full

[66] For the background of this decisive stage in the history of the East-West relationship see "A Chronicle of the Carmelite Mission," with hitherto unpublished documents and correspondence between 'Abbās I and Pope Clement VIII. Among the embassies which were sent by 'Abbās I to the Pope and the rulers of Europe from 1599 on figure prominently the Shirley brothers, Husain 'Alī Bey (1599), Zalyn al-'Abidīn Beg (1603), France da Costa (1604) and others. Already in 1592 Pope Clement VIII had invited 'Abbās I, "the illustrious and most puissant king of the Persians" to join a Christian league against the Sultan of the Turks. See Chronicle, pp. 68ff., 71–75, 85ff.

[67] The Carmelite mission was established in Isfahan in the year 1608. Prior to their settlement there were already other Christian missionaries in Persia, especially Portuguese and Spanish Augustines in 1602; in 1608 French Capuchins settled in Isfahan. See Fr. Berthold Ignace, "Histoire de l'Etablissement de la Mission de Perse par les Pères Carmélites Déchaussées," Bruxelles, 1885.

[68] About the diplomatic relationship between Persia and Poland see now P. Joseph Krzyskowski, "Entre Varsovie et Ispahan" (dealing with Père Ignace-Francois Zapolski) in "Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu," 1949, pp. 85–117. Not available for this study was Abbé Wenceslas Preiss: "De restauratione missionum in Persia saec. XVII, Poloniaeque partibus. . . ." (Pontificium Institutum Missionale scientificum, Roma, 1939.)

paged Old Testament illuminations, containing four pictures on each page, illustrating 283 events of the Old Testament, from Genesis to the Book of Kings, each of which carried explanations in Latin." [69]

The presentation of the manuscript of the Bible illuminations [70] took place in Qazvin in January, 1608, and, according to one source, it is stated that "the king opened the book of the Old Testament by chance at the page where the combat between the good angels and the bad angels is related. When he saw the dragon vanquished and prostrate at the feet of St. Michael, who was brandishing his sword, threatening the Devil, the king inquired, " 'Who is that vanquished at the feet of the angel?' Fr. Paul replied: 'This is the fallen angel, whom we call the Devil.' 'No,' said the Shah, laughing much, 'this is the Turk' (i.e., the Sultan). As he said it, he continued to laugh, glancing over his shoulder at the Turkish pashas . . . for he lost no opportunity to mock at them." [71]

Since 'Abbās I was unable to read the Latin explanation, but was most curious to know the exact meaning of each illustration, he charged a Mulla to write below each page of the manuscript, in the Persian language, what they represented. In order to enable the Mulla to do this more correctly the Shah referred him to the Christian missionaries of the Carmelites to get from them the meaning of each picture and insert it below in the Persian tongue. This was carried out, as the manuscript, still preserved, proves.[72]

[69] It took the Carmelite priests three years before they arrived in Qazvin, the residence of Shah 'Abbās I, because they could not take the shorter route via Aleppo, Baghdad and Isfahan due to the Turkish-Persian war.

[70] For all details pertaining to this manuscript, its history and illustrations, see S. C. Cockerell, "A Book of the Old Testament Illustrations of the Middle of the 13th Century," Cambridge, 1927, Roxburghe Club, pp. 25–77, 145–146. It might be interesting to mention that this manuscript of Bible illustrations, due to unknown circumstances, came to Europe, via Cairo to London, where it was for sale in 1844 and was later, in 1916, purchased by the J. Pierpont Morgan Library in New York.

[71] "Chronicle of the Carmelites," l.c., p. 124, Note 2.

[72] It is surprising to find that these Old Testament illustrations contained the explanations not only in the original Latin and Persian translations as ordered by Shah 'Abbās, but also a Hebrew transliteration of the Persian text at the margins of each miniature, evidently added by and for the convenience of a Persian-speaking Jew, either by order of the Shah or out of his own initiative when he obtained possession of this manuscript.

This first contact of Shah 'Abbās I with the Bible — in the form of Old Testament illustrations — seemed to have aroused his interest in the exact text of the Psalms and the Gospel, and moved him to order their translation into Persian.

The man who was charged by 'Abbās I with this task was John Thaddeus (d. 1633), the leader of the Carmelite mission in Persia and later their bishop in Isfahan.[73] He won the friendship of the Shah, became his close advisor, and was even sent by him on a diplomatic mission to Moscow, to Poland and to the Pope, which he had to give up, however, uncompleted, in 1614. After his return from this special mission, John Thaddeus was requested to translate the Psalms and the Gospels into the Persian language, which task was begun in 1616, in Isfahan. John Thaddeus obtained the help and coöperation of a Persian Jew in Isfahan for the translation of the Psalms into Persian. In a letter of March 26, 1615, John Thaddeus writes, "I am composing various works in the Persian language, translating into it the Christian doctrine, the Gospels, the Psalms of David, in which in particular I have taken especial pains, because over this translation I have had three Persian Mullas and one Jewish Rabbi, a native of Persia, employed; the last mentioned interprets from Hebrew text, which I correct in the Latin. The two Persians go on writing it down. . . . The preface to these Psalms I have taken from St. Augustine." [74]

Thaddeus was summoned by Shah 'Abbās I to Qazvin (probably on June 18, 1618), to submit to him the book of the Psalms in the Persian tongue, "which were accepted by the king with great pleasure and in deepest reverence." [75] It was this manuscript of

[73] About John Thaddeus see "A Chronicle of the Carmelites," l.c., pp. 195, 233, 241, 304, 922–933; Ambrosius a S. Teresia: Bio-Bibliographia: Missionaria Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum," Romae, 1941, Nos. 56, 98, 115, 154ff., 158, 172; see also Ambrosius a S. Teresia: "Nomenclator Missionarum Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum," Romae, 1944, pp. 220–221.

[74] "Chronicle," l.c., pp. 231–233; 241, 992. About other instances of the intellectual coöperation between Jewish, Christiain and Muslim scholars see later.

[75] "Chronicle," pp. 240–241, 924. There exist several eye-witness reports about the audience of Thaddeus with Shah 'Abbās which differ in details only. See Garcia de Figueroa, "Commentarios," Madrid, 1903–05, Vol. II, p. 101, "The Shah sent to call Fr. John Thaddeus. . . The reason for the coming of this religious had been to bring the Shah the Psalms of David and the New Testament written in the

the Psalms which remained the first and only translation of the Bible during the rule of 'Abbās I, and which is now preserved in the library of Oxford.[76]

The changed political and military conditions in the later years of 'Abbās I's rule caused a cooling-off of relations between the Shah and the Christian missionaries. The prestige of the Christians in Persia was also greatly lowered in consequence of the non-fulfillment of the promises made by the Pope and the Christian kings of Europe to start military action against Turkey. The great opportunity European Christianity had of recovering the holy places through a Christian-Persian alliance-crusade against the Ottoman rule was thus lost. Furthermore, 'Abbās I no longer needed any Christian help, since he himself was militarily successful against Turkey, and his sympathy for and interest in Christianity underwent a fundamental change. In addition, the treatment of Persian subjects by Portuguese Christians in Ormuz and other factors were a contributing reason for this change of mind.[77]

Under the successors of 'Abbās I, and particularly under 'Abbās II (1642–1666), no direct negotiations between the Pope and the Shah seem to have taken place, and consequently there was no reason for any contact between the Shah and the Carmelite or other Christian missionaries in Persia. The increasing influence of the Shia clergy, the central rôle of the Vizir in the conduct of affairs of the State — the Shah being only nine years old — precluded that intimacy between Shah and missionaries which had marked the last fifty years under 'Abbās I. This changed atmos-

---

Persian tongue, and very well bound in two volumes. . . ." Compare this report with Florencio del Niño Jesus, "En Persia," Vol. III, pp. 106–113, and the account in Pietro della Valle, "Viaggi," p. 425, Letter 1619. Thaddeus also presented to Shah 'Abbās a book of the Gospels, printed in Arabic and an Arabic alphabet "and acquainted him with the printing of Arabic and Persian letters in which he took much pleasure, expressing a wish to introduce it to his own country." Indeed, the Carmelites can claim that they were the introducers of the printing of Oriental script or any kind of script into Persia. Cf. Chronicle, pp. 233, 305, 306, 922.

[76] A manuscript copy of this first Persian translation of the Psalms carried out at the request of a Muslim ruler, Shah 'Abbās of Persia, is preserved in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, brought there probably by Sir Thomas Roe on his return from India. See Sachau-Ethé, "A Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts," No. 3776, in the Bodleian Library, October, 1889, Vol. I, p. 1050, No. 1828; also No. 1830; see also E. Rossi, "Studi e Testi," l.c., pp. 72–73, Vat. Perse, 42.

[77] Chronicle, l.c., pp. 97, 102, 129, 131, 161, 208, 364ff.

phere was not conducive to arousing interest in the Holy Books of the non-Muslims in Persia.[78]

As far as documentary evidence shows there was no further interest in the Bible and its Persian translation under the later rulers of the Safavid dynasty.

It was only a century later and under a new dynasty that a Persian Shah again took a special interest in the translation of the Holy Books, namely, Nādir Shah, one of the most remarkable rulers on the throne of Persia.

VI

The Persian Bible Translations as ordered by Nādir Shah (1740–41)

1.

In the annals of Persian history Nādir Shah (1734–1747) ranks as one of the greatest Asiatic conquerors. After the chaos which followed the overthrow of the Safavid and Afghan dynasties, he restored Persia's power and glory, saved it from annihilation by foreign invaders, and extended its borders far into Afghanistan and India, which he invaded in 1739.[79]

The same ruler, whose fame as the last great Asiatic conqueror is indisputable, was, at the same time, a kind of religious reformer. Nādir Shah accepted the throne of Persia only upon the condition that Shia Islam, which had been the State religion since the rise

[78] About Shah 'Abbās II and the persecutions of Jews and Christians see "Chronicle," l.c., p. 364 to 366, the Judaeo-Persian Chronicle of Babai b. Lutf and Babai b. Farhad, publ. in extracts by W. Bacher: Les Juifs de la Perse au XVII et au XVIII Siècles, Strassburg, 1907; and the Armenian Chronicle of Arakel of Tabriz. The chapter on the Persian Jews in the Armenian Chronicle was published in Russian translation in Jewr. Starina, Vol. X, Petersburg, 1918, pp. 60–76. See also Abraham Galanté in "l'Haménora," Istanbul, 1935, and the present writer's study on "The Jews under the Safavid Dynasty" in "Zion" (a Quarterly for Research in Jewish history) Jerusalem, 1937, pp. 273–293.

[79] The most comprehensive studies on Nādir Shah are V. Minorsky, "Esquisse d'une Histoire de Nader Chah (in Publ. de la Société des Études Iraniennes, No. 10), Paris, 1934; L. Lockhart, "Nadir Shah, A Critical Study based mainly upon contemporary sources," London, 1938. (See also Journal Central Asian Society, London, 1939), A. G. Pawar, "Nadir Shah" (from some original English Records), Journal of Bombay University, Bombay, 1942, Vol. X, Part IV, pp. 1–32. For a detailed description of Nādir's campaign in India, see besides Lockhart, l.c., pp. 122–162, Muḥammad 'Alī Ḥazin, Chapter 47, pp. 295–301; also J. Sarkar, "Nadir Shah in India," Patna, 1925.

of the Sefavid dynasty at the beginning of the sixteenth century, be abolished. Through a fusion of Shia and Sunna, and by proclaiming the Ja'fari rite as the fifth sect of Sunna Islam, he had hoped to reach a rapprochement with Sunnite Turkey, whose opposition to Shia was of long standing, and thus perhaps prepare the ground for making himself the head of a united Muslim world.[80]

His attitude towards the various religious groups of his empire, especially towards Christians and Jews, was not less remarkable than his attitude towards Islam.[81] He employed as his court physicians the Jesuit Fathers Bazin and Damien, he did not oppose the presence and establishment of foreign missionaries on Persian soil, supported the Armenian Catholics generously, and even went so far as to settle a considerable number of Armenian Christians and Jews in the holy city of Meshhed, his residence in Khorasan.[82]

With this Nādir Shah is connected one of the most interesting phases in the history of Bible translations into Persian. Independent in matters of Muslim tradition and religion, and differing from his predecessors in his attitude towards religious minorities, Nādir Shah fostered the idea of a universal religion embracing Islam, Christianity and Judaism. "If God is one, religion must be one," he maintained, reminiscent of Akbar's "Tauḥīd Ilāhi" concept.[83] His interest in the other religions is said to have been aroused by reading and discussing a Koranic passage (Sura 48, 29) in which reference is made to "Taurāt" (Pentateuch) and

[80] Lockhart, l.c., p. 279, where he writes: "Nadir may have intended the term Ja'fari to be sugaring for the Sunni pill which the majority of his Persian subjects would otherwise have found even more difficult to swallow; on the other hand, he and his advisors must have realized that this term, by reason of its strong Shi'a association, would be displeasing to such rigid Sunnis as the Ottoman Turks." See also H. Ritter in "Der Islam," Berlin, 1926, Vol. 15, p. 106; V. Minorsky, l.c., p. 17.

[81] Lockhart, l.c., pp. 278–281, where Nādir Shah is rightly characterized as "international rather than national in his outlook."

[82] About Meshhed and Khorasan see E. Herzfeld, "Khorasan: Denkmalsgeographische Studien zur Kulturgeschichte des Islam in Iran," "Der Islam," XI (1921), pp. 107–174; M. Streck "Meshhed" in Encycl. of Islam. See also the present writer's study on "The Jews of Central Asia (Khorasan) in Medieval Hebrew and Islamic Literature," in Historia Judaica, New York, 1945, pp. 29–50.

[83] See Père des Vignes "Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses écrites par des Missionaires de la Compagnie de Jesus," Paris, 1780, Vol. IV, p. 402; Lockhart, l.c., p. 281; Minorsky, l.c., pp. 37–38.

"Ingīl" (Gospels). When Nādir Shah inquired whether these revealed books were still in existence and upon receiving an affirmative reply,[84] he ordered their translation in order to acquaint himself with their teachings.[85] The Royal Decree issued by Nādir Shah shortly after his return from his successful invasion of India in 1740 commanded the translation into Persian of the Pentateuch (Taurāt), the Psalms (Zabūr), the Gospels (Ingīl) and the Koran.[86]

That this decree did not remain unfulfilled is borne out by the fact that manuscripts of a Persian translation of the above-mentioned books are extant in European libraries, all of which, as clearly indicated in their prefaces and colophons, owe their translation to a special "order of Nādir Shah of the year 1740 in Isfahan." [87]

Nādir Shah seemed to have regarded this translation order as so important that he entrusted no less a person than his own court historian, Mirza Mahdī,[88] with the execution of this decree. The royal decree stressed that the translation was to be word for word, without any omission or addition, and without a commentary of any sort, and it was to be submitted to the Shah at a later date. Assisted by two other Persian scholars, Mīr Muḥammad Maʿṣūm al-Ḥusainī al-Khātūnābādī and his son, Mīr ʿAbdu'l-

[84] See "Memoirs of Khojeh Abdul Kurreem," translated by F. Gladwin, Calcutta, 1788, pp. 89–92.

[85] In "A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia," l.c., p. 985, it is stated: "Among other schemes he (Nādir Shah) conceived that of devising a state religion, to be based on selections from the Books sacred to the various religions practised in the country, ordering that each community should produce translations in Persian — Jews, Christians, Muslims."

[86] Concerning these terms in Islamic tradition and theology see the respective articles in Encycl. of Islam; also, Goldziher, Z.D.M.G., Vol. 32, p. 348ff.; J. Horovitz, "Koranische Untersuchungen," Berlin, 1926, p. 69ff.

[87] Our major sources of information are the Prefaces and Colophons in the Manuscripts of the Persian translations of the Pentateuch, Psalms, Gospels, and Koran which the present writer had occasion to examine in Paris and London, respectively. For primary European sources see "Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses écrites par des Missionaires de la Compagnie de Jesus," Paris, 1780, Vol. IV, pp. 402–407; Jonas Hanway, "The Revolutions of Persia, containing the History of the Celebrated Usurper Nadir Kouli (1687–1747)," London, 1753, Vol. II, pp. 217–221; J. Malcolm, "The History of Persia," 1815, Vol. II, p. 104, and particularly the accounts and letters of eye-witnesses and contemporary visitors to Persia as contained in the above-mentioned "A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia and the Papal Mission of the 17th and 18th Centuries," 2 vols., London, 1939.

[88] About Mirza Muḥammad Mahdī, see Lockhart, l.c., pp. 292–296.

Ghanī, Mirza Mahdī began his work in Isfahan. He and his assistants selected four Jewish scholars, eight Christian and four Muslim scholars from Isfahan, and in coöperation with all of them the translation of the holy books was started.[89] These men were requested to examine every word of the holy books and to find the true Persian meaning of it, and after discussion and consultation with the Persian experts, the proper Persian term was fixed in writing. This method was applied equally to the Pentateuch, Psalms, Gospels and Koran.

It should not be assumed that these Jewish, Christian and Muslim translators were linguists or Bible experts. Their knowledge of Persian was far from sufficient for their assignment.[90] The method of translation was, however, so peculiar that their lack of Persian did not matter. The work was actually carried out, not by the so-called translator, but by Mirza Mahdī and his staff of Persian scribes, who had to render each word of the Holy Books, which was orally explained to them, into the Persian language and Persian characters.

The translation began in May, 1740 and lasted almost a full year, up to June, 1741.

2.

The first of the Holy Books thus translated was the Pentateuch. This task was assigned to four Jewish rabbis, of whom the name of only one is known. He was a certain Baba ibn Nuriel who was also one of the translators of the Psalms.[91] The Jews chose a faultless Hebrew manuscript, with which they compared, as expressly stated, the texts of other manuscripts containing translations into Latin and Arabic, made by Christian scholars of

[89] See B. Dorn, "Ueber die auf Nadir Schah's Befehl verfasste Persische Uebersetzung der Vier Evangelien," in Bulletin histor.-phil. de l'Académie impériale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg, 1848, Vol. V, No. 5. See J. Th. Zenker, "Bibliotheca Orientalis," Leipzig, 1861, Vol. 2, p. 102; and E. Rossi, "Elenco dei Manoscritti Persiani," l.c., pp. 172–173.

[90] One of the eight Christian scholars, the Carmelite bishop, Philip Mary stated, "I repeat once more that it was neither I nor the missionary fathers who made the translation, but the Persians alone. . ." (Chronicle, l.c., p. 638, Note 1.)

[91] Concerning this Baba b. Nuriel and his translation, see G. Margoliouth, "Catalogue of Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum," l.c., vol. 1, Nos. 159 to 160, pp. 120–121 (Nos. 4729 and 2452); H. Ethé, in Literaturblatt f. Oriental Philologie, 1883, vol. 1, p. 186.

European nationality.[92] The result of their labor was a Pentateuch consisting of a completely vocalized transliteration of the Hebrew text into the Persian script, together with an interlinear translation, written in red ink, of each Hebrew word into the Persian language.[93]

The translation of the Psalms followed; the Jews wrote the Persian translation of the Psalms first in Hebrew characters, which was then transliterated into Persian characters by one of the Persian scribes.[94]

It was more difficult for Mirza Mahdī to select the translators for the Gospels, because of the presence of different Christian groups and orders in Isfahan and the religious rivalries among them. The group of Christian translators, therefore, consisted of eight men, namely, of two Roman Catholic missionaries and two Armenian Catholics, on the one side, and two orthodox schismatic Armenian monks and two priests, on the other side.[95]

From all the available evidence it is clear that the translation of the Gospels was made not from the Latin or any other European language directly into the vernacular Persian, but from an Arabic

[92] The Jewish experts neither knew of nor used the first printed Persian Pentateuch translation made by Jacob ben Tavus (Constantinople, 1546). They were also unaware of the London Polyglot Bible (1657) and of the translations made by the Carmelites and others, as outlined in previous pages.

[93] This Persian Pentateuch translation is preserved, see E. Blochet, Catalogue des Manuscrits persans, l.c., Vol. IV, No. 2208, pp. 166–167. J. Wolff, "Researches and Missionary Labors," London, 1835, p. 195, claims to have bought a manuscript of this Persian Pentateuch translation and to have sent it as a present to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

[94] For details pertaining to this Psalm translation see G. Margoliouth, l.c., No. 159, pp. 120–121. As we know (from the previous pages), this was by no means the first translation of the Psalms into Persian. This Psalm translation was apparently the basis of a printed edition of the Psalms in Hebrew and Persian by Benjamin Hacohen Bukhari (Vienna, 1883). It is stated in "Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scriptures in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society," compiled by T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, London, 1911, Vol. 4, pp. 1210–1211, "This diglot edition includes a Persian version based upon a translation prepared by Baba Nuriel by order of Nadir Shah (1688–1747)."

[95] The names of the Carmelite translators are known. They were Bishop Philip Mary, Fr. Urban of St. Elisaeus, and Fr. Thomas Aquinas; the latter, however, died during the preparation of the translation (see Chronicle, pp. 636, 984–987, 1012–1013 and 1018). It is interesting to note that Father Philip Mary, in a letter of April 11, 1740 relates that he was "forced to go and assist in the translation, which the Shah had ordered to be made into Persian of the Holy Gospels, the Psalms, the Pentateuch and the prophecy of Isaiah, and the Quran." (Chronicle, pp. 634, 986.)

translation of the Vulgate of the Gospel. Even the Armenians had accepted this version in order to avoid differences of translation between their Armenian version and the Vulgate.[96] Thus, they jointly tried to come to an agreement on every expression and this, in turn, was rendered into Persian by the Persian scribes. It was natural, nevertheless, that the diversity of opinion among the various Christian participants often gave rise to different explanations, and that controversies arose between the Catholic and other collaborators as to the real meaning and correct interpretation of certain words and terms.[97] It is stated that in such cases of disagreement the final decision was made by Mirza Mahdī who, "in general, guided solely by reason, decided mostly in favor of the Catholic explanation." [98]

The Christian translators must have had some strange ideas regarding Nādir Shah's real reasons and motives in ordering the translation of the Holy Books. One view has it that Nādir Shah wanted these translations in order to base, on selections from the books sacred to the various religions practised in his country, his contemplated new religion of Persia. Another view assumes that Nādir Shah needed these translations before summoning the heads of every creed for the purpose of public religious disputations. Some were of the opinion that the royal order was especially directed against the Christians, because of the constant clashes and conflicts between the schismatic Armenians and the Catholics, and that the Shah wished to learn the nature of the differences

[96] It is evident that the Christian translators did not make use of any earlier Persian translation of the Gospels, such as that made by John Thaddeus by order of Shah 'Abbās I in 1618, or those which owe their existence in Europe to G. Vecchietti or Father Xavier in Agra, India. All these earlier manuscripts were unknown to them. Only six years after the Gospel translation was completed did one of the Christian translators discover in the archives of the Convent of Isfahan the Gospel version of the year 1618. See E. Blochet, Catalogue des Manuscrits Persanes, l.c., Vol. I, No. 7, p. 6, which is a copy made by Père Legrand in Gilan in 1746. The manuscript of the original translation seems to have disappeared, but was found again years later by Bishop Philip Mary. See "Chronicle," p. 638, Note 1; and John Buchanan, "Christian Researches in Asia," London, 1812, pp. 182–184.

[97] The work was divided among the various Christians in such a way that the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse were assigned to the Armenians, while the Catholic missionaries were assigned to translate the four Gospels.

[98] See Chronicle, pp. 634, 636; des Vignes in "Lettres Edifiantes," l.c., Vol. IV, p. 402.

between them in order to set up a unified religion amongst the Christians.[99] It might also be that Mirza Mahdī, in search of the proper translators, had given the Christian leaders to understand that after the completion of the Persian translation Nādir Shah would choose that which would appear to him to be the best law or creed, or else would combine them into one after his own mind and fashion, he himself to be its compiler. The rumor was also spread that Nādir Shah was thinking of becoming a Christian, and it was this prospect, dim as it must have appeared even to them, which had strongly increased the zeal of the Christian translators and their care to make a correct translation according to the royal order "without omission or addition." [100]

For the translation of the Koran, Mirza Mahdī selected four Mohammedans. It was probably not too easy to find the proper Muslim scholars since, in view of the Islamic law against the use of the Koran in any other language than Arabic, not every devout Mohammedan would have been ready to undertaken the translation of their Holy Book. The translation of the Koran was, however, carried out and the translators, as commanded, rendered literally the Arabic text, without adding anything to it, without omitting a single word and without making any comment.[101]

3.

After the completion of their task in June 1741 the Muslim, Christian and Jewish translators, with their books in their hands, appeared before Nādir Shah at Qazvin in the summer of 1741 in order to present the result of their labors. They had to wait several days before they were admitted to the Shah, but orders were given to treat them courteously and honorably as guests of the Shah, until he could receive them. When the day for the

[99] About the steady quarrels between the various Christian groups, the sources supply an abundance of documentary evidence. See Chronicle, pp. 634, 637–638, 985.

The internal quarrels between the Roman Catholics and the Armenians had greatly increased during the year of Nādir Shah's absence in India. The Armenians persecuted the Catholics and demanded the expulsion of the Catholic missionaries in 1740, even petitioning the Viceroy to this effect.

[100] Chronicle, l.c., p. 636.

[101] For the manuscript of the Persian Koran translation see E. Blochet, Catalogue, l.c., Vol. 4, No. 2210, p. 168.

audience arrived, so it is reported, the translators were conducted all together to the gate of the royal garden and there made to halt. There they experienced a terrible prelude to their audience with the Shah. They saw "to their horror, every now and then, enter that gate men of all sorts, who were led before the Shah with halters round their necks and there strangled, to be afterwards dragged out like animals and their corpses thrown out in the fields for the wild beasts to eat. This spectacle lasted almost an hour, during which time eighteen were strangled. The Persian translators trembled and so did the Jews, the Armenians showed some sort of courage in their looks; but our Fathers (Carmelite) were beyond measure delighted, hoping to have attained the crown of martyrdom so much desired by them." [102]

There was, however, no need for concern regarding their safety, and the Fathers lost "so fine an opportunity of making such a happy transfer from this vale of tears to the land of eternal happiness." They were finally informed that the time had come for them to enter. The order of the procession was that the Christian Carmelites were placed first, the Persian mullas following them, next the Jews, and lastly the Armenians, each of them having in the hands of their principal representatives the translation of the books in question.

The translators, after having been asked whether they had finished their work, answered the Shah by saying "We have brought them in order to have the honor of presenting them." This they then did, by passing the manuscripts to him by the hands of the officials through whose mouths they had spoken. It is reported that the Shah received the translations without glancing at them, saying that he had not the time to examine them and that he would notify them when he wished them to return. He distributed the sum of one hundred tomans to be divided amongst them. The Jews, who were four, received twenty tomans, the Persian mullas, who were eight (four were the assistants of Mirza Mahdī), received forty, the Christian missionaries, who were three, fifteen, and the Armenians, who were five, received twenty-five. The translators were then given orders to depart, each to his own abode, being informed by the Shah that he would notify

[102] Chronicle, l.c., p. 635ff.; 1018.

them when he wished them to return, and to "await any tidings." That they were never again summoned is evident.

The disappointment of the religious leaders, Christians, Jews and Muslims alike, may well be imagined. Their labor, so devotedly and honestly carried out over a period of almost a full year, did not, aside from the material remuneration of a few tomans, result in the fulfillment of any of the hopes they had entertained. This was particularly saddening for the Christian translators, who actually had expected, as an outcome of the translation, that some advantage would accrue to the Christian faith, and perhaps would even result in Nādir Shah's conversion to Christianity.

This description of the meeting with Nādir Shah in Qazvin, based on eye-witness accounts and contemporary sources, seems to mirror the real course of events. Another version, widely spread of this meeting, however, differs greatly from that report. According to the accounts of some European authors, particularly of Hanway, whom Malcolm copies,[103] the Shah at his audience in Qazvin asked the translators to read extracts from their translations to him. The Shah, it is stated, amused himself and some of his hearers "with ludicrous remarks on the mysterious part of the Christian religion; at the same time he laughed at the Jews and turned Mahammud and 'Alī equally into ridicule." Then Nādir Shah allegedly broke up the assembly with the declaration, "If God spared him he would make a religion much better than any which mankind then possessed." [104]

This description is not supported by the eye-witness account of reliable contemporaries and must be suspected as a distortion of the real facts. There was no disruption of the assembly and no ridiculous remarks were passed in the presence of the delegates.

[103] See Hanway, l.c., pp. 217–221, and Malcolm, l.c., Vol. 2, p. 104. The account given by E. G. Browne in "A Literary History of Persia," Vol. 4, p. 137 is based on Malcolm's statement, and furthermore, marred by a number of additional inaccuracies. Browne placed the meeting not in Qazvin but in Teheran, and omits mention of the Pentateuch and the Psalms. He writes: "Nadir Shah commented on the translation with derision and hinted that when he found leisure he might (perhaps after the model of Akbar) produce a new religion of his own, which should supplant alike Judaism, Christianity and Islam." See also Chronicle, p. 635ff.

[104] "Lettres Edifiantes," Vol. 4, p. 402ff.; Hanway, l.c., p. 218ff.

The outcome of this meeting tends to confirm the view that Nādir Shah became indifferent to religion as such and that all his religious reforms served only his imperialistic political and secular aims and ambitions.[105] Just as his attempt to merge Shia and Sunna was a result of political calculation with the eventual goal of making himself the head of a unified Muslim world, so his edict to translate the Holy Books into Persian, whatever the original motive may have been, had no serious meaning or consequence. All that he intended was obviously to show himself indifferent to any and all religion so that "men of every race and sect might come the more willingly to serve him."

4.

The question has to be asked as to how this whole project of the translation entered Nādir Shah's mind and whether he conceived this idea himself, independently or under the influence of any previous attempt of a similar nature.

We have seen how under widely different political and cultural circumstances a similar interest in the Holy Books was evinced by such contrasting personalities as Shah 'Abbās I, of the Sevafid dynasty, and Akbar the Great, the Moghul emperor of India in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is, however, evident that the Persian translation of the Psalms, as ordered by Shah 'Abbās I, or those carried out by Vecchietti, or by Sarmad in India, remained entirely unknown to Nādir Shah and to his Christian and Jewish translators.

In search of a possible clue to the motives for Nādir Shah's decree, we are led to assume that the whole idea of a Persian translation of the Holy Books entered Nādir Shah's mind during his campaign in India (1739–40).

[105] It might well be — with the words of Father Leander — that: "Nādir Shah was disturbed in mind by the fresh rout of his people by the Uzbaks, who killed another cousin of his and, on the other hand, suspecting that the Sultan of Constantinople might be about to declare war on him in view of the fact that the latter had been reinforcing garrisons and getting armies ready at Kars and Erzerum, his thoughts turned back to the political and military government of his dominions and he abandoned his religious ideas, to which, as it was rumored, he had never given real attention." Chronicle, p. 638, quoted from "Leandro di Santa Cecilia, Secondo Viaggio dell' Oriente." Rome, 1757.

The biographers of Nādir Shah agree on this. Malcolm [106] states: "Soon after Nādir Shah's return from India he had directed that the transliteration . . ." and Lockhart [107] writes: "It was apparently during Nādir's Indian expedition that his interest . . . was aroused," and that "while still in India the preliminary steps for the translation of the Holy Books had been ordered." [108]

In all probability, India, the soil which gave birth to the ideas of an Akbar the Great, stimulated also Nādir Shah. Nādir's attempt to translate the Holy Books appears, indeed, to have been prompted by his desire to follow in the footsteps of Akbar.

We need only to recall the famous letter of Akbar to the Spanish king, Philip II, in 1582, asking for the "heavenly books such as the Pentateuch, Gospels and Psalms in Arabic or Persian translation" to realize the similarities of these two personalities and their ideas.[109]

Although the atmosphere of religious toleration, so intense under Akbar's reign, had long since dissipated, it must have been Nādir Shah's acquaintance with the religious heritage of Akbar that moved him to emulate the example of this great religious reformer of India and to act along similar lines in his own country, Persia.

Just as Nādir Shah tried deliberately to model his military career on that of the great Timur (Tamerlane) he might also have wished to shape his religious activities on the pattern of Akbar. Just as Akbar had charged his court historian, Abu'l Fazl, to have the Gospels translated into Persian and to assemble in his capital the leaders of all religions, to learn from them their religious tenets, so did Nādir Shah charge his court historian with

[106] Malcolm, l.c., Vol. 2, p. 220.

[107] Lockhart, l.c., p. 280.

[108] According to one tradition, recorded by the author of "Ta'rīkh Nairang i Afghān" it is said, "When Nādir Shah, on his way to India, reached Peshavar, the chiefs of the Yusufzai tribe presented him with a manuscript of the Old Testament (Taurāt) written in Hebrew along with some other documents relating to their old prayers. The Jewish soldiers recognized them at once."

Although the credibility of this tradition is doubtful it may well be that this incident might have affected Nādir Shah's idea of the Persian translations of the Holy Books. See Imad Uddin, "The Origin of the Afghans," in Islamic Culture, 1949, p. 8; also A. K. Johnston, in "Review of Religion," June, 1904, p. 240.

[109] See above notes 52 and 53.

the same task. The parallel is too striking to be a mere coincidence.[110]

Thus, Akbar's religious and philosophical ideas flickered up again and came to live once more one and a half centuries later — although only for a short revival on Persian soil, where they were tried again by another great Asiatic ruler — Nādir Shah.

The royal order of Nādir Shah, in any case, produced as its concrete outcome and result the Holy Books in Persian translation, the four manuscripts of which are now housed in the libraries of Europe. These manuscripts, though they can hardly be regarded as of philological or textcritical value have, nevertheless, considerable cultural and historical interest. Their very existence proves an unusual degree of intellectual and religious cooperation of people of various creeds, brought about by the will of an all-powerful Muslim ruler. This coöperation, lasting for almost a year, gathered — and this is certainly a unique feature in those days — Shia Muslims, Jewish Rabbis, and the various Christian leaders, working together for one common goal.

It is true that instances of intellectual coöperation between individual scholars of various religious convictions in Persia are not entirely unknown, even for the period of the Safavids, when the social and political barriers between believers and non-believers were most rigidly observed, and when the political climate for non-Muslims was at times highly unfavorable.[111]

Thus, the famous Mohammedan theologian, scholar and traveller, Sheikh Muhammed 'Alī Ḥazin, born in Isfahan in 1692, who emigrated to India in his later years and died there in 1779, states in his Memoirs "Tadhkirat al-Aḥwāl": [112] "I now felt a desire to

[110] Nādir's relationship to Akbar's ideas would deserve a special thorough study. For references to this relationship see Hanway, l.c., Vol. 2, p. 220: "The Emperor Akbar, though not so great a warrior, had as liberal a mind as Nadir Shah"; and E. Blochet, "Catalogue," l.c., No. 2208, "Nādir, probably in the hope of succeeding where Akbar had failed . . .; see also Lockhart, l.c., p. 1, pp. 80–81 as to points of similarity between Nādir Shah and Timur.

[111] Steinschneider, "Die Arabische Literatur der Juden," Frankfurt °/M, 1902, p. XVII) has already rightly remarked: "Der Boden auf welchem Muslim und Juden am häufigsten und leichtesten einander naeher traten war der der Wissenschaft und Literatur"; and "Man verkehrte viel und bekehrte wenig" (l.c., p. XXI.).

[112] See E. G. Browne, l.c., Vol. 4, pp. 277–281; and the "Life of Sheikh Mohammed Ali Hazin (1692–1767), transl. by F. C. Belfour, Oriental Translation Fund, London, 1830, Chapter 9, p. 62.

inform myself on the questions and truth of the different religions and concerning the followers of the various sects. I became intimate with the doctors of the orders of the Christians and their padres and tried and measured the quantity of knowledge of each of them. . . From him I learned the Gospel and obtaining access to the commentaries upon it, I thought to investigate their articles of faith and the principle of their religion and read a great number of their books. Among the Jewish inhabitants in Isfahan who, as they believe, have since the time of Moses been dwellers in that town, there was one named Shuaib, the most learned of his brethren. I learned from him the Bible, had the interpretation of it written for me and informed myself of the truth of all that they maintain." [113]

Likewise, it is reported that the famous author of "Tadhkira-i-Shushtar," 'Abdullah ibn Nūr ad-Dīn ash Shushtarī (1700–1759) a contemporary of Nādir Shah, and even a strong Shia Muslim "has ransomed a distinguished Christian priest, brought him home and read the New Testament with him with great care." Similarly, he arranged to bring to Shushtar to his own house, "a Jewish scholar from Isfahan, as well as a priest from the fire worshippers from Yazd and read all their religious books with them for a long period." [114]

These and similar manifestations of inter-confessional relationships, however, were the result of the interest of individual scholars in search of truth and knowledge. We have, however, in Nādir Shah's experiment an example of an intellectual coöperation on an official scale, inaugurated by a head of a State, by a Persian ruler himself.

[113] He added, however, "but I found that order of man totally destitute of knowledge and learning and entire strangers to thought and discernment. Their stupidity and obduracy in ignorance are without end or measure."

[114] His work was edited under the title "Tadhkira-i-Shustar," an account of Shustar from the earliest time to 1169 (1756), ed. by Hussain (Bibliotheca Indica), Calcutta, 1924, Vol. 206. The author entered the service of Nādir Shah as a supervisor of religious state functions. He had religious discussions with Nādir Shah in which he presented the Shi'a religion; see Introduction, pp. VIII–IX.

VII

The Persian Pentateuch Manuscripts in Meshhed

Another rather curious attempt to transliterate the Hebrew Pentateuch into Persian characters deserves mention, in connection with Nādir Shah.

As mentioned above, Nādir Shah showed a remarkable tolerance towards his Jewish subjects.[115] In order to increase the permanent population of his capital in Meshhed, and not to be compelled to rely, for the protection of the eastern borders of his empire, on the fluctuating elements, the pilgrims, he transplanted groups of people, Christians as well as Jews, from other corners of Persia to Meshhed. Meshhed was the holiest city of the Shiites in Persia and seat of the mausoleum of Imam Riza, the most important place of pilgrimage for the Shia Moslems. Through this shifting of population Meshhed also became the center of a Jewish community. Jews from Qazvin,[116] in northern Persia, were transplanted to Meshhed and neighboring villages where, prior to the time of Nādir Shah, there were no Jews, because the holy character of the city excluded non-believers from this part of Persia. Neither the Safavid rulers nor the population with its religious fanaticism would have permitted their holy city to be "contaminated" by the presence of Jews or Armenians; [117]

[115] Neither Minorsky nor Lockhart mention specifically Nādir Shah's attitude towards his Jewish subjects. See R. Patai, "A Popular Life of Nadir" in "Edoth," Jerusalem, 1948, pp. 1–20, with some notes by Lockhart. About the cruel execution of two Armenians, two Zoroastrians and four Jews in Isfahan in 1747, having been accused of theft, see "Chronicle," l.c., pp. 651–652; Lockhart, l.c., p. 258; Lettres Edifiantes, l.c., IV, p. 30.

[116] About the transfer of Jews from Qazvin to Meshhed in the time of Nādir Shah the oral tradition still preserved among the elders of the community is supported by a written document, namely, a Hebrew poem by Salomon ben Mashiaḥ of Meshhed, in which the Qazvin origin of the Jews of Meshhed is especially mentioned and the events described which led to the forced conversion of this community in 1838. This "Piut" (poem) entitled "Shira l'meoraoth Anusei Moshe . . ." is incorporated in the Prayer Book of the Persian Jews, "Oneg Shabbat" composed by Mulla Murad, the secret Rabbi of the Meshhed community, and published in Jerusalem in 1909. See also J. Wolff, Researches and Missionary Labors, l.c., who states, "When Nadir Shah arrived at Casween he took the Jews from thence (together with the Armenians from old Djulfa) and brought them to Meshhed where he gave to all of them the privilege of erecting synagogues," pp. 125, 135, 227. See also M. Streck, in Encycl. of Islam, s.v., Meshhed.

[117] In the Judaeo-Persian Chronicle of the 17th century by Babai ben Lutf and Babai ben Farhad, Meshhed does not figure as a seat of a Jewish settlement, but

only Nādir Shah, a foe of the Shia, and bent upon religious reforms, could dare, despite the opposition of the Shia clergy, to establish a Jewish community in this holy place.

This community in Meshhed continued to survive long after Nādir Shah's assassination in 1746, and only in 1839 met with a tragic disaster.[118]

This city houses a large library of manuscripts in the famous mosque of Imam Riza, and it is in the catalogue of this library that three Persian-written manuscripts are listed, which are of a peculiar nature.[119] Upon examination of these three manuscripts it became clear that their language, though written in Persian-Arabic characters, was Hebrew. They represented nothing less than a transliteration of the first three books of the Hebrew Pentateuch into Persian characters, a "Tarjumat-Taurāt" made in the time of Fatḥ 'Alī Shah (1798–1834) and his successor, Mahmūd Shah (1834–1848) of the Kajar dynasty.[120] We can assume that these transliterations were the product of a coöperation between Persian and Jewish scholars, since they could not have been prepared without the help of someone who had a full knowledge of Hebrew as well as Persian. The actual writing and copying must have been done by a Persian Muslim scribe, since the Persian-Arabic script was alien to Persian Jews until recently,

---

Qazvin is mentioned. See W. Bacher, "Les Juifs de Perse au XVII[e] et au XVIII[e] siècles," Strassburg, 1907.

[118] The fate of this community after the death of Nādir Shah is a tragic story which led to their forced conversion and to the phenomenon of "Marranos" (Jadīd-ul-Islām) in 1839; see the present writer's study on "The Marrano Community in Persia," in "Zion," Jerusalem, 1936, pp. 49–74, and in "Commentary," New York, January, 1949, pp. 27–33.

[119] See "Fihrist Kutub Kitabkhāna Astāna Muqaddis Rizāwiya," 3 vols., Meshhed 1345 A.H. (1928–29), Catalogue of the Library of the Imam Riza Mosque, Vol. I, pp. 22–23, Nos. 50–52, where the manuscripts of the first three books of the Pentateuch are listed. During the author's stay in Meshhed in April, 1936, he had the opportunity of examining these manuscripts in the library of the famous mosque of Imam Riza in Meshhed.

[120] The Persian entry informs us under No. 50, "Tarjumat-Taurāt" by an unknown translator in the time of Fatḥ 'Alī Shah (1797–1834) presented as Waqf in 1262 A.H. (1846–1847), 251 pages. The manuscript of Exodus, No. 51, dates from 1226 A.H. (1809), 250 pages, and No. 52, Leviticus from 1216 A.H. (1799), 244 pages. See W. Ivanoff, "A Notice on the Library attached to the Shrine of Imam Riza in Meshhed" (JRAS), London, 1920, p. 550, where reference is made to the Manuscripts Nos. 50, 51 and 52 (Pentateuch) and to 53 (Injīl); also E. Herzfeld, "In Ephemerides Orientales." Leipzig, January, 1925, No. 28; O. Spies, in "Orientalistische Studien," in honor of Enno. Littmann, Leyden, 1935, pp. 89–100.

while a Jew, faithful or converted, must have helped in the work. The writing of the manuscript shows a very experienced Persian hand. The names of the translators are not indicated; only the name of the Persian scribe of one manuscript (No. 51) is given, namely, Mohammed Hussain Juwānī. Whether these translations are the result of any order by Fatḥ 'Alī Shah [121] or any dignitary in the holy city of Meshhed, we do not know. In any event, we have here another interesting indication of an intellectual co-operation in the field of Bible studies carried out by Jews of a community which was established, as we have seen, about 1736 by Nādir Shah.[122]

[121] It might well be that Fatḥ 'Alī Shah was instrumental in ordering this transliteration of the Pentateuch books after he became acquainted with H. Martyn's translation of the New Testament into Persian. The English Ambassador in Teheran, Sir. G. Ouseley, presented to the Shah in 1814 Martyn's Persian translation of the New Testament (published in St. Petersburg in 1815 and in Calcutta in 1816). Concerning the reaction of Fatḥ 'Alī Shah, see De Sacy in "Journal des Savants," Paris, 1816, pp. 45–50.

In the 19th century new attempts had been made to translate the Bible into Persian, particularly on behalf of the Christian missionary societies who worked in Persia. H. Martyn's Persian translation of the New Testament was transliterated into Hebrew characters and in 1847 it appeared in London, to be distributed among the Jewish population of Persia.

At the request of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Old Testament also was translated into Persian, written with Hebrew characters, with the help of Mirza Nurallāh and Mirza Khudaidād of Teheran, and published 1895 to 1907.

This interesting chapter of Bible translations by European missionary societies cannot be dealt with here. Of the vast literature in this field, reference is made only to the following publications: "A Century of Mission Work in Iran (1834–1934) printed for private circulation" (Beirut, 1936); J. Richter, "A History of the Protestant Missions of the Near East" (New York, 1910); W. T. Gidney, "Sights and Scenes; A Description of the Oriental Mission of the London Society for the Promoting of Christianity among the Jews" (London, 1897); F. H. Darlow-Moule: "Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scriptures in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society," London, 1911, Vol. IV, p. 1209; and William Canton: "A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society," London, 1910, Vol. II, p. 353, 377–378; Vol. V, pp. 68–82; 431.

[122] The latest attempt thus far known to translate the Bible into Persian or rather into the Judaeo-Persian dialect of the Bukharian Jews, is connected with the name of Simon Chacham (1843–1910), a Jewish scholar from Bukhara, who went to Jerusalem in 1890 and began in 1906 the translation (Tafsir) of the whole Bible into the Persian dialect of his Bukharian countrymen. This undertaking was completed in 1914 by Simon Chacham's collaborators, and up to the present this Bible translation has been widely used. See the present writer's study, "Israel in Iran, A survey of Judeo-Persian Literature," in The Jews, Their History, Culture and Religion, ed. L. Finkelstein, New York, 1949, pp. 848–850, and his article in Jewish Social Studies, New York, 1950, pp. 119–160.

KINGDOM AND POLITY IN EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

F. EDWARD CRANZ

Connecticut College

Eusebius of Caesarea occupies a unique position in ancient Christian thought. His central problem is to explain and justify a Christian society which is to transform the Roman Empire and which will become the new world civilization supplanting Hellenism and Judaism. Earlier thinkers do not face this problem. The Roman Empire is for them one of the powers ordained of God, but it is pagan and they expect it to remain so.[1] Consequently the question of human government is only peripheral to their thought. Nor do later thinkers see the problem quite as Eusebius does. In the East, for example in Pseudo-Dionysius and John of Damascus, the question of human government again becomes peripheral to Christian thought, and Eusebius has no successor as a "political theologian." In the West, Augustine gives a general answer to the problem of a Christian society in a Christianized Empire, but his solution contradicts that of Eusebius. To Augustine, the structure of the Christian Roman Empire is still that of Babylon, and human society is still a mixture of two opposed cities, the earthly city and the city of God.

The writings of Eusebius are therefore the best evidence for a position which must be made clear if we are to understand the history of the idea of the Christian society. The thought of the first three centuries contains as a possible development Eusebius' kingdom of Constantine as well as Augustine's pilgrim city of God. Byzantine imperial theory rests on assumptions similar to those of Eusebius. And Augustine's solution is understandable in

[1] This viewpoint is epitomized in the well-known remark of Tertullian: Sed et Caesares credidissent super Christo, si aut Caesares non essent necessarii saeculo, aut si et Christiani potuissent esse Caesares. Apologeticum XXI, 24 (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum LXIX, 58–59). For a fuller statement, cf. Origen, Contra Celsum VIII, 72f. (ed. P. Koetschau in: Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Vol. II, 288f. Leipzig, 1899).

all its power only when we see it as an implicit denial of Eusebius' position.[2]

In recent years certain aspects of the social and political thought of Eusebius have received considerable attention. N. H. Baynes [3] pointed out in an important article that Eusebius' speech to the Emperor Constantine contains a Christianization of the Hellenistic theory of kingship, and J. Straub [4] provided a broader background for the analysis of this relationship. E. Peterson [5] brilliantly characterized Eusebius' doctrine of monarchy as a type of "political theology," and from somewhat different points of view the same topic has been treated in articles by H.-G. Opitz [6] and H. Eger [7] and discussed incidentally by H. Berkhof [8] in a book on the theology of Eusebius.

The purpose of the present article is to carry these investigations further by a more precise analysis of the two main concepts, kingdom and polity, used by Eusebius in thinking about the Christian society. Here, on the basic level of terms and concepts, we meet our main difficulty in understanding Eusebius. His thought is neither overly speculative nor complicated, yet those trained in one or another of the Western traditions find his Christian terminology a stumbling-block. Catholic and Protestant may disagree, for example, about the kingdom of God; each, however, will probably feel that Eusebius is arbitrary or perverse in his use of the concept to explain the imperial power of Constantine. But Eusebius, all in all, appears to have been an honest writer and to have been guided in his thought by a form of the Christian experience. An analysis of his key concepts and of his first

[2] For a statement of Augustine's position and a preliminary comparison with Eusebius, cf. F. E. Cranz, "De Civitate Dei XV, 2, and Augustine's Idea of the Christian Society," Speculum XXV (1950), pp. 215–225.

[3] N. H. Baynes, "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," Mélanges Bidez (Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales, II, Brussels, 1934), pp. 13–18.

[4] J. A. Straub, Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte XVIII, Stuttgart, 1939), p. 113f.

[5] E. Peterson, Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem (Leipzig, 1935), p. 71f.

[6] H.-G. Opitz, "Euseb von Caesarea als Theologe," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft XXXIV (1935), pp. 1–19.

[7] H. Eger, "Kaiser und Kirche in der Geschichtstheologie Eusebs von Cäsarea," ibid. XXXVIII (1939), pp. 97–115. Cf. also H. Eger, "Die ersten Ansätze zu einer politischen Theologie in der christlichen Kirche," Deutsche Theologie II (1935), pp. 272–281.

[8] H. Berkhof, "Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea," Amsterdam, 1939.

assumptions should serve as a further step on the way to a creative understanding of his whole position.

Eusebius [9] wrote at length on many topics, and a goodly number of his works have been preserved. The following list will facilitate references. It is grouped roughly by subjects and includes only the works important for our present purpose.

I. Apologetic Works.
   1. Eclogae Propheticae [10]
   2. Praeparatio Evangelica [11] (cited as PE).
   3. Demonstratio Evangelica [12] (cited as DE).
   4. De Theophania [13]

II. Biblical Commentaries.
   5. Commentaria in Isaiam [14] (cited as In Isaiam)

[9] For a general account of the writings of Eusebius, cf. the article by E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyklopädie, Vol. VI (1909), 1370–1439; W. v. Christ, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur (6th ed. by W. Schmid and O. Stählin, München, 1924), Zweiter Teil, pp. 1359–1372. A brief account with recent bibliography may be found in B. Altaner, Patrologie (Freiburg, 1950), pp. 195–201.

[10] Ed. T. Gaisford, Oxford, 1842; reprinted in J. P. Migne, Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca (hereafter cited as PG) XXII, 1017f. The Eclogae Propheticae were originally Books VI–X of the Generalis Elementaria Introductio, now lost except for a few fragments and the Eclogae. There is a considerable lacuna in Book II of the Eclogae; on it cf. G. Mercati, "La grande lacuna delle Ecloghe Profetiche di Eusebio di Cesarea," Archives de l'orient chrétien (Mémorial Louis Petit), I (1948), pp. 1–3.

[11] Ed. with an English translation by E. H. Gifford, 4 vols., Oxford 1903. A new edition is in preparation by K. Mras; cf. his remarks, "Ein Vorwort zur neuen Eusebius-Ausgabe," Rheinisches Museum XCII (1944), pp. 217–236, and "Meine Eusebiusausgabe," Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien LXXXIV (1947), pp. 115–120.

[12] Ed. I. A. Heikel (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller (hereafter cited as GCS) XXIII, Leipzig, 1913). There is an English translation by W. J. Ferrar, 2 vols., London, 1920.

[13] The De Theophania is preserved complete only in a Syriac version, edited, together with a German translation and the Greek fragments, by H. Gressmann (GCS XI, 2, Leipzig, 1904). An English translation was done by S. Lee, Cambridge, 1843. Eusebius also wrote a De Secunda Theophania dealing with Christ's Second Coming; on it cf. E. Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 1431–1433. Only fragments survive, and these are found, though without adequate identification, in A. Mai's edition of the Greek fragments of the De Theophania, reprinted in PG XXIV, 607–690, and in his edition of the so-called Commentaria in Lucam (reprinted in PG XXIV, 527–606).

[14] Ed. B. Montfaucon, PG XXIV, pp. 77–526. The material collected by Montfaucon comes from various "chains" on Isaiah, but while incomplete it is in general authentic. Cf. R. Devreesse, "L'édition du commentaire d'Eusèbe de Césarée sur Isaïe," Revue Biblique XLII (1933), pp. 540–555. Recently almost the entire Commentaria in Isaiam has been discovered, but it is not yet published, cf. A. Möhle, "Der Jesaiakommentar des Eusebios von Kaisareia fast vollständig wieder aufge-

6. Commentaria in Psalmos [15] (cited as In Psalmos)
7. "Commentaria in Lucam" [16] (cited as In Lucam)

III. Writings Connected with the Emperor Constantine.

8. Vita Constantini [17]
9. Laus Constantini [18] (cited as Laus)

---

funden," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft XXXIII (1934), pp. 87–89, and "Ein neuer Fund zahlreicher Stücke aus der Jesaiaübersetzung des Akylas, Symmachos, und Theodotion," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft LII (1934), pp. 176–183.

[15] The printed material of the Commentaria in Psalmos varies greatly in value. B. Montfaucon first published a connected commentary on Psalms LI–XCV, 3 and used material from chains for Psalms I–L and XCV, 7–CXVIII (PG XXIII, 65–1396). A. Mai found some scattered material on CXIX–CL (PG XXIV, 9–76). Finally some very dubious additions on Psalms I–CXVIII were supplied by J. B. Pitra, Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata (Venice, 1883) III, 369–520. All of these published Commentaria in Psalmos must be used with caution: cf. R. Devreesse in, Dictionnaire de la Bible (ed. F. Vigoroux, Paris, 1895–1912) Supplement I (1928), pp. 1122–1124 and "La chaine sur les Psaumes de Daniele Barbaro," Revue Biblique XXXIII (1924), pp. 65–81. G. Mercati long ago discovered a good manuscript (Bibliotheca Ambrosiana F 126 sup.) for the commentary on Psalm XCVIf., but it has not been published; cf. Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo, ser. II, Vol. XXXI (1898), 1036f.

[16] The title "Commentaria in Lucam" was given by A. Mai to a group of fragments first published by him (PG XXIV, 527–606). The title is a misnomer, and if the fragments belong to a single work, this must be the De Secunda Theophania (cf. note 13, above).

[17] Ed. I. A. Heikel (GCS VII, pp. 1–148, Leipzig, 1902); cf. also the additions in I. A. Heikel, Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius (Texte und Untersuchungen 36, 4 (1911)). There is an English translation in : Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd Series, Vol. I (New York, 1890), pp. 481–559. The authenticity of the Vita Constantini has been attacked in recent years, most aggressively by H. Grégoire in numerous articles, e.g. "Eusèbe n'est pas l'auteur de la "Vita Constantini" dans sa forme actuelle et Constantin ne s'est pas converti en 312," Byzantion XIII (1938), pp. 561–583. Grégoire declares (p. 562) that while the work may contain a Eusebian kernel, "Mais ce qui est sûr, c'est que des vastes parties . . . sont d'une époque bien plus tardive que celle d'Eusèbe." For some typical discussions of the Grégoire thesis cf. J. Vogt, "Streitfragen um Konstantin den Grossen," Mitteilungen des deutschen archaeologischen Instituts, Röm. Abt. LVIII (1943), pp. 198–203; A. Piganiol, "L'état actuel de la question constantinienne 1930–49," Historia I (1950), pp. 82–96, part. 82–84; and Heinrich Karpp, "Konstantin der Grosse und die Kirche," Theologische Rundschau XIX (1951), pp. 1–21, part. 6–7. The present writer is not convinced that the existence of extensive interpolation has been proven, but when use is made of parts of the Vita Constantine which have been declared non-Eusebian, that fact will be noted.

[18] Ed. I. A. Heikel (GCS VII, 195–259, Leipzig 1902); cf. the additions in I. A. Heikel, Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius (Texte und Untersuchungen XXXVI, 4 (1911). There is an English translation in: Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd Series, Vol. I (New York, 1890), pp. 581–610. The Laus Constantini is composed of two distinct parts. Chapters I–X are the Tricennalia delivered on the thirtieth anniversary of Constantine's accession to power; Chapters XI–XVIII are a brief apology of Chris-

IV. Historical Works.
10. Historia Ecclesiastica [19]
V. Theological Treatises.
11. De Ecclesiastica Theologia.[20]

. . .

Kingdom (basileia) and polity (politeuma — politeia) are for Eusebius the two most important social concepts. At the highest level of thought they become one, and the kingdom of heaven may be identified with the heavenly Jerusalem.[21] But the two concepts are developed somewhat differently in Eusebius' discussion of the Christian society, and they will be treated separately.

§1. Kingdom (Basileia)

Eusebius uses the concept of kingdom [22] to define man's nature and his destination: man is by nature a kingly animal and his destination is the kingdom of heaven. When the Logos placed in man's soul the image and likeness of God, he "made him a kingly animal and showed that he alone on earth could study to rule and be ruled in kingly fashion." [23] And man will attain his destination only when the Logos-Christ appears in his second kingly theophany and when all Christians come to participate in the kingdom of heaven. "And this is the thrice-blessed goal, when Christ grants the promised kingdom of heaven to those worthy of it, and when

tianity in defense of the Emperor's building activities in Palestine. On the problem cf. the edition by Heikel, pp. civ–cvi, and his Kritische Beiträge, pp. 81–87.

[19] Ed. E. Schwartz (GCS IX, Leipzig, 1903–09). There is an English translation by K. Lake and J. E. L. Oulton in the Loeb Classical Library (2 vols., London, 1926–32).

[20] Ed. E. Klostermann (GCS XIV, pp. 59–182, Leipzig, 1906).

[21] Cf. in Psalmos XIV, 1 (PG XXIII, 149D); ibid. LXIV, 23 (PG XXIII, 625B–C).

[22] On the early Christian use of "kingdom" cf. Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (ed. G. Kittel, Stuttgart, 1933–), Vol. I, pp. 562–595; R. Frick, Die Geschichte des Reich-Gottes-Gedanken in der alten Kirche bis zu Origenes und Augustin (Beiheft VI, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft), Giessen, 1928. Some interesting notes on the concept of kingdom in the Greek fathers by G. W. H. Lampe may be found in the Journal of Theological Studies XLIX (1948), pp. 58–73.

[23] Laus IV, 2 (GCS VII, 203). Cf. also Laus III, 5 (GCS VII, 201); III, 6 (GCS VII, 202); DE IV, 6, 7 (GCS XXIII, 160); In Psalmos VIII, 7–9 (PG XXIII, 129C–D). For a close parallel to the last passage, cf. the Commentaria in Psalmos ed. Pitra: VIII, 6 (Vol. III, 390).

the God of all, his father, the highest good, shall give himself to those ruled in kingly fashion by the Son, becoming 'all in all'." [24]

All kingdom ultimately derives its meaning from God. The divine kingdom is in some way the original, the archetype, the reality; all other kingdoms must be related to it as image or symbol or shadow. Any human kingdom is therefore in some sense the reflection of a divine original, but in different ages of history the reflection has appeared differently.

Man in his original state was, as we have seen, a kingly animal made in the image of God. He was created so that he might praise the godhead and its kingdom and so that even on earth there might be an image of the heavenly Jerusalem.[25] If man had known his own greatness and if he had followed the teaching of God, then he would naturally have passed from the childhood image of the earthly kingdom to the adulthood of heaven.[26] But all men misused their royal freedom. They denied God and modelled themselves after the false images of polytheism. As a result the human kingdom degenerated into the disorder and constant war of polyarchy and anarchy; civilization disappeared and men lived as animals.[27]

But gradually and by various stages the Logos-Christ restored man to his true nature. In the first stage man was brought back to a knowledge of monarchy. The Jews abandoned their worship of many gods and acknowledged only Jehovah, though they were still too close to the polytheism of their fathers to be told of the Son or of His kingdom of heaven.[28] A slow movement back to polity and civilization took place throughout the world. Finally the Roman Empire triumphed over the disorder of polyarchy, and a monarchy on earth now imaged the monarchy in heaven. But the acceptance of monarchy by Jews and Romans was only a partial

[24] De Ecclesiastica Theologia III, 18 (GCS XIV, 179).

[25] De Theophania I, 37 (GCS XI, 2, p. 55); ibid. I, 40 (GCS XI, 2, p. 58).

[26] De Theophania I, 66–77 (GCS XI, 2, pp. 70–79).

[27] De Theophania, I, 78–79 (GCS XI, 2, pp. 79–80) and I, 39 (GCS XI, 2, p. 57); Laus V, 2 (GCS VII, p. 204). The description of fallen man and his society as animal-like is common in Eusebius: e.g. DE VIII, Pr. §6f. (GCS XXIII, p. 350f.); Laus VII, 2 (GCS VII, p. 212); Historia Ecclesiastica I, 2, 18f. (GCS IX, 1, p. 20f.); PE II, 5 (ed. Gifford I, p. 94).

[28] Eclogae Propheticae I, 12 (PG XXII, 1068B); In Psalmos LXXXVI, 2–4 (PG XXIII, 1045D); Historia Ecclesiastica I, 3, 7f. (GCS IX, 1, p. 32).

restoration of man and not yet specifically Christian, though even Eusebius will emphasize it when arguing with those who are still attracted by polytheism.[29]

The coming of Christ inaugurates the second and last stage in human history, for He told all men not only of the divine monarchy but also of the Son and of His kingdom of heaven. The whole kingdom of God, which the natural reason knew only in part and which the Jews knew only in obscure prophecy, was now revealed. In consequence, images of the full heavenly reality appeared on earth: the Christian Empire (kingdom) of Constantine and the Christian ecclesia or church.

In the Vita Constantini Eusebius describes a scene which for him embodies both aspects of the new society which Christ had made possible. Constantine was celebrating the twentieth anniversary of his accession to power, and there were public demonstrations throughout the Empire. The Emperor himself invited the Christian bishops to a special festival within the royal palace, and Eusebius says that one might think of this assembly of Constantine and the bishops as an "image of the kingdom of Christ." [30] But for the most part Eusebius treats Empire and ecclesia separately and we shall follow his example.

Eusebius analyzes the problem of the Empire most carefully in the speech (the Tricennalia) which now forms the first part of the Laus Constantini. Constantine's Empire (kingdom) here appears under two general aspects. From one standpoint he is the third in a series of royal figures: 1. God the Father. 2. The Logos-Christ, the archetypal image of the Father. 3. The Emperor, the image of the Logos-Christ. From a somewhat different standpoint, Constantine is an example of the kingship of any Christian man, restored to the true image of the Logos and in some way participating even here in the kingdom of heaven.

In the opening section of the speech, Eusebius works out at some length the parallels between the Logos as archetype and Constantine as its image. God is the king adored and served by all, in

[29] De Ecclesiastica Theologia II, 22 (GCS XIV, pp. 132–133); PE I, 1 (ed. Gifford I, pp. 4–5).

[30] Vita Constantini III, 15 (GCS VII, p. 84). *Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἔδοξεν ἄν τις φαντασιοῦσθαι εἰκόνα, ὄναρ τ'εἶναι ἀλλ' οὐχ ὕπαρ τὸ γινόμενον.*

supreme fashion by the only-begotten Logos "from whom and through whom the king dear to God (i.e. Constantine) bears the image of the highest kingdom. By imitation of the greater king he steers in a straight course all things on earth." [31] The Logos prepares heaven, earth, and the highest kingdom for the Father; Constantine leads all on earth to the Logos and prepares them for his kingdom. The Logos destroys the demons, and Constantine crushes the visible enemies of truth. The Logos gives men reason and the ability to understand his father's kingdom: Constantine like an interpreter of the Logos calls all men to a higher knowledge. "And so, adorned with the image of the kingdom of heaven, he (Constantine) looks up at the archetypal idea and governs those below in accord with it. He is strong by his conformity to the (divine) monarchical power." [32]

Eusebius then approaches the position of Constantine somewhat differently, not from the standpoint of the one kingship of the Roman world but from the standpoint of the kingship which belongs to all men and to all Christians. Again he begins with the monarchy of God. Only God is good and wise and strong, "the begetter of justice itself, the father of reason and wisdom, the spring of light and life, the treasurer of truth and virtue, and the author of kingship itself and of all rule and authority." [33] But how is man to know all this? Who has seen the invisible kingdom of all things or the invisible ideas beyond all form? Only the *one* Logos can mediate this knowledge to man. Hence our self-taught, natural convictions, hence the seeds of justice and prudence, hence all culture and civilization.

As mediator between God and the creation, the Logos made man a kingly animal with hope of a heavenly kingdom. When all men had fallen, He did not hesitate to come among them, and He cared for and renewed the seed which He had sown. He told all men of their share in the heavenly kingdom, and He modelled this kingdom by a representation on earth.[34]

The Emperor Constantine is then described as an outstanding

[31] Laus I, 6 (GCS VII, p. 199).
[32] Laus III, 5 (GCS VII, p. 201).
[33] Laus III, 6 (GCS VII, p. 202).
[34] Laus IV, 2 (GCS VII, p. 203).

example of the Logos' mediation between God and man. Constantine's soul is adorned with the inborn virtues, and he receives divine emanations from above. He is rational from the universal Logos, wise by communion with wisdom, temperate by the idea of temperance. He may truly be called a king, for he "moulds his soul by royal virtues to a representation of the kingdom above." [35] He is truly a victor "who is modelled from the archetypal idea of the great king and whose mind is formed, as in a mirror, by the beams of the virtues which come from this archetypal idea." [36] Constantine may therefore properly wear the robes of Empire, but at the same time, as a Christian with hope of the eternal kingdom, he will regard all earthly kingdom as unimportant. "He knows that the present is not worthy of comparison with God the king of all, that things mortal and perishable flow past like a river and cease to exist, and he longs for the incorruptible kingdom of God . . ." [37]

In addition to these general descriptions of Constantine, as ideal emperor and as ideal Christian, Eusebius in the Tricennalia and elsewhere frequently emphasizes Constantine's unique historical position as the first Christian Roman Emperor. In part Eusebius here makes use of earlier writers who argue that the Empire plays a part in God's plan for the salvation of mankind.[38] Origen, for example, argues that a single unified Empire is necessary for Christian missions.[39] But Eusebius goes further than Origen or any of these earlier writers when he establishes an essential parallelism between the Empire and Christianity. Polyarchy and war had corresponded to polytheism; now monarchy and peace were to correspond to Christianity.[40] In his early writings and in the apologetic works, Eusebius tends to make Augustus the key figure, and the empire appears as an illustration of God's direct intervention in history.[41] In the later works the approach is slightly dif-

[35] Laus V, 2 (GCS VII, p. 203).
[36] Laus V, 4 (GCS VII, p. 204).
[37] Laus V, 5 (GCS VII, p. 204).
[38] For a general discussion of Christian views of Roman history and its relation to Christianity, cf. E. Peterson, Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem (Leipzig, 1935), p. 59f.
[39] The main texts may be found in Peterson, op. cit. p. 71f. Cf. also In Psalmos II, 9 (PG XXIII, 89A); XLV, 9–10 (PG XXIII, 412B–C); LXXI, 6–8 (PG XXIII, 801D–804A).
[40] Cf. Origen, Contra Celsum II, 30 (GCS II, p. 158).
[41] E.g. PE I, 4 (ed. Gifford I, pp. 12–13); DE III, 7, 30f. (GCS XXIII, p. 145f.).

ferent, and the Empire seems almost a consequence of Christianity. "The power of our saviour destroyed the polyarchy and the polytheism of the demons, and it announced to all men, to Greeks and to barbarians, and to those at the ends of the earth, the one kingdom of God. The Roman rule, with the causes of polyarchy removed, subjected the visible polyarchies and aimed to bring together the whole human race into one unity and concord." [42] Eusebius argues that it will succeed "since the Saviour's teaching with divine power makes all things easy for it and smoothes the way." [43] As a result of this different approach, the later interest of Eusebius centers on the Christian character of the Empire, and Constantine rather than Augustus becomes the key figure.

Eusebius never tires of relating the special favors of God toward Constantine. There is the well-known story of the visions before the battle of the Milvian Bridge, and Eusebius tells us that there were many similar occasions.[44] These special favors correspond to Constantine's special place in history. He is the new and greater Moses.[45] And in one passage of the Tricennalia he appears as an almost Messiah-like figure who single-handed defeats all the earthly forces of evil.[46]

Such are the main features of Eusebius' account of the Constantinian Empire in terms of kingdom. It is an image on earth of the archetypal kingship of the Logos in heaven. It is an example of the Logos-mediated kingship of all Christians. And it is a special aspect, first in its pagan and then more fully in its Christian form, of the divine work of restoration by which fallen man is led back to his true nature.

[42] Laus XVI, 6 (GCS VII, pp. 249–50). Cf. De Theophania III, 2 (GCS XI, 2, pp. 127–128).

[43] Laus XVI, 6 (GCS VII, p. 250).

[44] For Eusebius' account of the first visions, cf. Vita Constantini I, 28–30 (GCS VII, p. 21). The account has been declared pseudo-Eusebian (cf. note 17 above), e.g. by H. Grégoire, "La vision de Constantin 'liquidée'," Byzantion XIV (1939), pp. 341–351. But cf. J. Vogt, "Berichte über Kreuzerscheinungen aus dem 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr." Annuaire de l'Inst. de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves IX (1949), pp. 593–606. For frequent divine revelations to Constantine, cf. Laus XI, 1 (GCS VII, pp. 223–224) and XVIII, 1–3 (GCS VII, p. 259).

[45] Vita Constantini I, 12, 2 (GCS VII, p. 13).

[46] Laus, VII, 12–13 (GCS VII, p. 215). H. Berkhof, Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea (Amsterdam, 1939), p. 58 points out that in the parallel argument of the De Theophania II, 83 (GCS XI, 2, p. 119) it is the Logos-Christ, not Constantine, who wins this victory.

We must now notice the way in which Eusebius describes the ecclesia in terms of kingdom. Unfortunately, the work which contained a full discussion of this topic has been lost, though fragments are preserved as the so-called Commentaria in Lucam.[47] The Old Testament commentaries include a few scattered references to the ecclesia as kingdom, but here Eusebius regularly works with a dieffrent terminology and describes the ecclesia in terms of polity. References in the apologetic works are even rarer; Eusebius, writing for an audience little trained in Christian doctrine, was probably afraid that a proclamation of the kingdom of the ecclesia might be understood as an attack on the kingdom of Rome. Nevertheless the available material can at least indicate the main outlines of Eusebius' position.

Christ came to this earth and founded His ecclesia for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. "In it (sc. the ecclesia) alone is the kingdom of heaven announced, and the whole aim of the saving Gospel has a view to this kingdom. The promise of salvation, and the Gospel proclamation, and all the hope of the polity of Christ looks to the kingdom of heaven." [48] Christ's doctrine may be described as "laws by which one may gain the kingdom of heaven." [49]

The ecclesia is therefore a stage on the way to the heavenly kingdom, and it is nearer to this kingdom than any previous society. Man before the Fall would eventually have gained the kingdom of heaven, but he would have learned of it only after leaving this life.[50] The Fall destroyed this way to the kingdom. Eusebius holds that Judaism was a new way to the kingdom of heaven, though here again there was no clear knowledge of it. Because of their crimes and in particular because of the final crime of the crucifixion, the Jews lost the kingdom and Judaism is no longer a road to it.[51] But now Christ not only proclaims the Gospel of the

[47] Cf. In Lucam XIV, 16 (PG XXIV, 576D). *Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἀλλοτρία τυγχάνει οὐδ' αὕτη τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, περὶ ἧς ἡμῖν ὁ πᾶς ἐνέστηκε λόγος.*

[48] In Psalmos LXXXVI, 2–4 (PG XXIII, 1045C).

[49] In Lucam XI, 21 (PG XXIV, 533B).

[50] De Theophania I, 72 (GCS XI, 2, p. 73).

[51] On the potential participation of the Jews in the kingdom of heaven, cf. In Lucam XIII, 20 (PG XXIV, 569B). On the loss of it, cf. De Theophania (= De Secunda Theophania) ed. Mai, Fragment VI (PG XXIV, 637D–640C). On the lack of knowledge in the masses of the Jewish nation, cf. De Ecclesiastica Theologia II, 20 (GCS XIV, p. 127f.); De Theophania (= De Secunda Theophania) ed. Mai, Fragment XVII (PG XXIV, 673C); and the passages cited in Note 28, above.

kingdom to all men; He also establishes the ecclesia which both leads to the kingdom and is an image of it.[52]

Eusebius applies this doctrine of the ecclesia as image of the kingdom in three ways: to Christ as the head of the ecclesia, to His followers in the ecclesia, and to the sacraments of the ecclesia. Christ Himself not only taught all men of the kingdom; He also performed various works which represent it. The miracles of healing and of casting out demons, for example, are patterns and marks of the kingdom.[53] When Christ had told His disciples of His second, royal theophany, He then demonstrated it to them by the Transfiguration which was an image of this kingdom.[54]

So Christ's followers in the ecclesia not only know but also image the kingdom, and the lives of true Christians here are symbols of it.[55] Eusebius apparently differentiates two types of symbol. The first corresponds to the lower form of Christian ethic, and it may be understood as the "natural" symbol of man made in the image of God and guided in his actions by the law of nature.[56] The second corresponds to the higher ascetic ethic. Here men still on earth and in the flesh try to imitate the life of the angels and to "take the kingdom of heaven by force." [57] Such imitation is, as it were, beyond nature and represents the kingdom of heaven more fully than does the natural image.

[52] In Psalmos LXIV, 2–3 (PG XXIII, 625B–C) . . . *ἡ καταγελλομένη τοῖς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον παραδεχομένοις βασιλεία οὐρανῶν. Εἰκὼν δ'ἐκείνης ἡ ἐπὶ γῆς γένοιτ' ἂν Ἐκκλησία.*

Eusebius only rarely calls the ecclesia a kingdom (cf. In Isaiam XXXII, 1–2 (PG XXIV, 317A)), and is very cautious in speaking about Christ's kingdom on earth: Eclogae Propheticae I, 13 (PG XXII, 1069C); De Ecclesiastica Theologia III, 15 (GCS XIV, p. 172). Indeed, from the standpoint of the properly "royal" Second Coming, he sometimes denies that Christ now exercises any kingdom on earth: e.g. De Theophania (= De Secunda Theophania) ed. Mai, Fragment XXII (PG XXIV, 688Cf.); in Lucam XIX, 12 (PG XXIV, 588D–589A); Eclogae Propheticae II, 2 (PG XX, 1093B); Historia Ecclesiastica III, 20, 4 (GCS IX, 1, p. 234), III, 39, 12f. (GCS IX, 1, p. 290f.).

[53] In Lucam IX, 1 (PG XXIV, 544A).

[54] In Lucam, IX, 26 (PG XXIV, 548D–49A); cf. also De Ecclesiastica Theologia III, 10 (GCS XIV, p. 166); Laus IV, 2 (GCS VII, p. 203).

[55] In Lucam XIII, 20 (PG XXIV, 569A).

[56] Eusebius' view of the natural in relation to the Christian cannot be discussed here, but it may be noted that in In Lucam VII, 29–30 (PG XXIV, 540Df.), the nations are called by natural laws into the vineyard which is the godly polity and through which they may attain the kingdom of heaven.

[57] De Theophania (= De Secunda Theophania) ed. Mai, Fragment XVII (PG XXIV, 673D–676A).

Finally, the sacraments of the ecclesia may be viewed as images of the kingdom. Christ in drinking the wine before His passion symbolized the royal feast of the heavenly kingdom,[58] and the Christians have images and symbols of this in the mysteries of the New Testament.[59] The Christians at Pentecost abandon the merely prophetic symbols of the Old Jewish festival and bear the image of the kingdom of heaven.[60]

It is now clear from Eusebius' discussion of kingdom that the ecclesia and the empire must be closely related. Both are images of the kingdom of heaven, and they may appear as one in the assembly of Constantine and the bishops,[61] or they may be described as the two aspects, rule and teaching, of Christ's kingdom on earth.[62] But they are still to be distinguished. The force necessary for the rule of the empire differs from the reason which supports the teaching of the ecclesia, and by no means all the subjects of the Emperor are Christians. Eusebius expects that as time goes on the Empire and the ecclesia will move closer and closer to a final Christian unity, and he often speaks as if this had already happened. We may suppose his hope to be that with increased knowledge of Christianity, there will be less need for force in the Empire, and the monarchy will survive largely as an expression of unified guidance. As the ecclesia continues to grow, it will finally fuse with the Roman *oikoumene*. The two images of the divine kingdom, the Empire and the ecclesia, will then tend to be identified in much the same manner as the kingdom of heaven and the heavenly Jerusalem.

§2. Polity (Politeuma—Politeia)

The concept of polity is as central as the concept of kingdom in Eusebius' discussion of the Christian society. In general, while he prefers to use kingdom in the description of the Empire, polity with its allied terms predominates in the discussion of the ecclesia. Three Greek words are here important: 1. *polis* 2. *politeuma* 3. *politeia*.

[58] In Lucam XIV, 18 (PG XXIV, 580D).
[59] In Isaiam XXV, 6–7 (PG XXIV, 268B–C).
[60] De Solemnitate Paschali IV–V. (PG XXIV, 697C–700C).
[61] Cf. note 30 above.
[62] In Psalmos II, 9 (PG XXIIII, 88D–92A); Laus XVI, 4f. (GCS VII, p. 249).

Of the three, *polis* (city) occurs most frequently in the Bible, and Eusebius often uses it.[63] But its connotations seem too limited and too material for his own purposes. Sometimes he explains it as a metaphor for those who live in a city.[64] More often he glosses it by *politeuma*[65] or *politeia*,[66] and these are the most common terms in passages where Eusebius is working out his own ideas.

The meanings of *politeuma* and *politeia*, as used by Eusebius, cannot be sharply distinguished, and both will hereafter be translated as "polity." Polity is a general name for a society seen in terms of its principle of organization. It can also point to the way of life in accord with that principle, but one must beware of underestimating the social implications: only very rarely in Eusebius can either *politeuma* or *politeia* be translated simply as "way of life." [67]

The concepts of city and polity can, like kingdom, explain the whole nature and destiny of man. As a rational animal he was placed on earth so that even in that part of the universe there might be an image of the great city of God.[68] If he had been true to his nature, man would after death have passed naturally to the heavenly city. But man fell and as a result he was barred from his proper destination. In time, as part of the work of restoration, God established Judaism as another polity leading to man's heavenly goal. But the Jews failed as citizens of such a polity, and they too were barred from the heavenly Jerusalem. Finally, Christ founded the ecclesia as a new and higher polity for the Christians. Through

[63] For the earlier history of the Christian society as *polis* and as Jerusalem, excellent accounts may be found in K. L. Schmidt, Die Polis in Kirche und Welt, Basel, 1939, and "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild" Eranos-Jahrbuch XVIII (1950), pp. 207–248.

[64] E.g. DE VIII, 2, 103 (GCS XXIII, p. 386); In Isaiam XL, 1–2 (PG XXIV, 364D).

[65] E.g. In Isaiam LI, 17 (PG XXIV, 449C); In Isaiam I, 27 (PG XXIV, 100); In Psalmos XLV, 4 (XXIII, 408D). For the meaning of *politeuma* in earlier Greek cf. W. Ruppel, "Politeuma. Bedeutungsgeschichte eines staatsrechtlichen Terminus" Philologus LXXXII (1926–27), pp. 268–312; 434–454.

[66] E.g. DE IX, 6, 6 (GCS XXIII, 417); In Isaiam XXII, 10–14. (PG XXIV, 248D.)

[67] For illustrations of the less social sense cf. DE I, 6, 1 (GCS XXIII, p. 23); DE I, 9, 10 (GCS XXIII, p. 41); Schwartz, Index to Historia Ecclesiastica (GCS IX, 3, p. 198). The less social sense is more common with *politeia* than with *politeuma*. Both words occasionally have the special sense of classes or orders in the ecclesia: In Isaiam XIX, 18 (PG XXIV, 232C); XLII, 11 (PG XXIV, 392A); XXV, 2 (PG XXIV, 265C).

[68] De Theophania I, 40 (GCS XI, 2, p. 58).

it all men may attain the thrice-blessed goal which is both the kingdom of heaven and the heavenly city of God.

The various kingdoms of Eusebius were all images of a single divine exemplar; in like manner the various polities are all ultimately images of the city of heaven. The most important title of this city are found in Eusebius' Commentary on Psalm LXIV as he discusses the verse, "A hymn befits Thee, O Lord, in Zion." "Not every hymn befits the Lord, but that which is raised in Zion, that is to say in His ecclesia. The true Zion is the heavenly Jerusalem and the heavenly mountain of God, teaching of which the Apostle says: 'But you have come up to Mount Zion, to the general assembly and ecclesia of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven.' (Hebrews 12,22.) And again: 'But the Jerusalem above is free, which is the mother of us all' (Galatians 4,26). For this would be the true Jerusalem in the highest sense, over which our Saviour and Lord is said to rule as king, as He says in Psalm II: 'I have been made king over Zion, His holy mountain.' (Psalms 2, 6.) The same is the kingdom of heaven which is announced to those receiving the Gospel." [69] Eusebius also calls this city the godly polity in heaven and the angelic polity.[70]

Of the various images of this original city, Eusebius is of course mainly concerned with the ecclesia. The commentary on Psalm LXIV continues: "An image of it (i.e. the true Zion and Jerusalem which Eusebius has identified with the kingdom of heaven) would be the ecclesia on earth, which may also be called now Zion and now Jerusalem, now the daughter of Zion or the daughter of Jerusalem." [71] In the Commentary on Psalm LXXXVI, Eusebius speaks of the heavens of heavens "where there is the great polity of the heavenly Zion and of the truly great city of God. . ." After quoting the usual texts, Hebrews 12,22 and Galatians 4,26, he concludes, "The image of this great city is the ecclesia of God on earth." [72] In the Commentary on Psalm L, he declares, "The godly polity bears the image of the heavenly city of God, on which account it has the same name." [73] The Christian ecclesia, the Chris-

[69] In Psalmos LXIV, 2–3 (PG XXIII, 625B).
[70] In Isaiam XLIX, 13 (PG XXIV, 436C); XXVI, 1 (PG XXIV, 272A); XLIX, 11 (PG XXIV, 436B).
[71] In Psalmos LXIV, 2–3 (PG XXIII, 625C).
[72] In Psalmos LXXXVI, 2–4 (PG XXIII, 1045B).
[73] In Psalmos L, 21 (PG XXIII, 441B).

tian society on earth, is an image of the divine society of heaven; it too may therefore be called Zion, Jerusalem, the city of God, and the godly polity.

When Eusebius is discussing the Christian society on earth, he has a marked preference for the phrase "godly polity." [74] Perhaps he feared that "ecclesia" might be understood in too limited a sense. In any case, "godly polity" has for him the advantage that it is a synonym for ecclesia, and at the same time clearly refers to the whole Christian society in all its aspects. In modern terms, the godly polity is Christian civilization, not merely the Christian church.

Eusebius thinks that in his own time there is only one godly polity, that of the Christians, but he also believes that a lower form of such a polity once existed among the Jews. In the Demonstratio Evangelica, Eusebius is again speaking of Zion and of Jerusalem: "Zion may be understood as the ecclesia which Christ has founded in every place of the earth and Jerusalem as all godly polity. This godly polity once existed only among the Jews and was made a desert by their impiety, but it was renewed and increased by the appearance of the Saviour." [75] On rare occasions Eusebius even calls the old Jerusalem and the old Zion images of the heavenly original.[76]

[74] Various phrases are found. Perhaps the most common when Eusebius is working out his own ideas is *τὸ θεοσεβὲς πολίτευμα* e.g. DE VI, 24, 6 (GCS XXIII, p. 293); VIII, 4, 25 (GCS XXIII, p. 399); De Theophania (= De Secunda Theophania) ed. Mai, Fragment VI (PG XXIV, 637B); in Isaiam XLIX, 11 (PG XXIV, 436B); LI, 17 (PG XXIV, 449C); LII, 7 (PG XXIV, 453B); In Psalmos XLVII, 2–3 (PG XXIII, 420D); XLVII, 13–15 (PG XXIII, 428C). There are numerous closely allied expressions e.g.: *ἡ θεοσεβὴς πολιτεία.* In Isaiam LIV, 3 (PG XXIV, 464B); DE III, 3, 3 (GCS XXIII, p. 109). *τὸ κατὰ θεὸν πολίτευμα.* Historia Ecclesiastica, V, Pr. 4 (GCS IX, 1, p. 400), where Eusebius declares that this godly polity is the subject of his history. *τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας πολίτευμα.* DE IV, 17, 21 (GCS XXIII, p. 199); V, 4, 2 (GCS XXIII, p. 224).

For the equivalence of godly polity, city of God, and ecclesia, cf. the following passages as examples: In Isaiam XXXI, 9 (PG XXIV, 316D); LIX, 14–20 (PG XXIV, 488C); LX, 12–13 (PG XXIV, 496A); LXVI, 7–8 (PG XXIV, 517B); In Psalmos LIX, 11 (PG XXIII, 572C); LXXI, 16–17 (PG XXIII, 816D); LXXXVI, 2–4 (PG XXIII, 1045A–D).

[75] DE VI, 24, 6 (GCS XXIII, p. 293); cf. also In Isaiam XXII, 1 (PG XXIV, 245A); XLIX, 11 (PG XXIV, 436A–B); LIV, 6–10 (PG XXIV, 464D–465A). In the commentary of Chapter XLIX, Eusebius apparently refers back to portions of the work not found in the printed editions.

[76] E.g. In Psalmos LXXIII, 2–7 (PG XXIII, 856C); Eclogae Propheticae III, 22 (PG XXII, 1145C). Eusebius never explains just how the two "godly polities" of the Jews and the Christians differed. Apparently he expects us to understand the

But this lower form of godly polity disappeared with the coming of Christ. The Jews denied the image of God, and so they were not worthy of his city. Eusebius interprets the parable of the vineyard as meaning that the Jews were once entrusted with the godly polity which is peculiar to the kingdom of God. However, they refused in one way or another to obey the lord of the vineyard, and as a consequence both polity and kingdom were transferred to the ecclesia.[77]

If the godly polity of the Christians looks backward to the Jewish form which it has transcended and superceded, it also looks forward to a complete triumph over the polytheistic polity of the Hellenes.[78] The Christian society is to become the city of the world, and Christian civilization will be coterminous with the inhabited world, the oikoumene.

Perhaps Eusebius' best statement of his hopes for the triumph of the Christian polity is his commentary on Isaiah XIX. The text here has a prophecy of a visit of the Lord to Egypt and of a civil war which will ensue. In Eusebius' interpretation, Egypt is the world of polytheism, and the civil war is the struggle between the atheists and the godly polity.[79] In the account of the outcome of the struggle, the Septuagint translation reads: "19,18 In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt speaking the Canaanite tongue, and swearing by the name of the Lord Sabaoth. The city Asedek shall be called one city." Eusebius explains that the five cities are in reality one city, the ecclesia. Further the ecclesia will be called the city of the earth, for this city alone is built to God throughout the whole earth so that of it may be said, "Glorious things are spoken of Thee, O city of God." (Psalm 86,3) [80] One might compare Eusebius' remark earlier in the same

---

difference in terms of the general contrast he makes between Judaism and Christianity. Sometimes he calls Judaism merely an image; then Christianity appears as truth and reality. Sometimes he starts from Christianity as image, and then Judaism appears as shadow and riddle.

[77] In Psalmos LXXII, 18–20 (PG XXIII, 845Af.); In Lucam VII, 29–30 (PG XXIV, 540D–541B); De Theophania (= De Secunda Theophania) ed. Mai, Fragment VI (PG XXIV, 637B–640C).

[78] For the contrast between the three polities of Christianity, Judaism, and Hellenism, cf. DE I, 2 (GCS XXIII, p. 7f.). On the atheistic polity of the pagans cf. In Isaiam XXV, 2 (PG XXIV, 266C), and PE X, 4 (ed. Gifford II, p. 18f.).

[79] In Isaiam XIX, 1f. (PG XXIV, 220f.).

[80] In Isaiam XIX, 18 (PG XXIV, 232B–C).

commentary, when he speaks of the ecclesia as the "common city." [81]

The godly polity of the ecclesia thus transcends both Judaism and Hellenism, and it moves toward its proper position as world civilization. In so doing, it absorbs and integrates all the existing elements of civilization, and it can do this because any excellence of man must be at least a partial image of the Logos which Christianity images whole.

Men were created as kingly animals in the image of God, and they were placed on earth so that here too there might be an image of the heavenly city. Men fell; they lost the image of the divine kingdom and city and wandered about the earth like animals. But the Logos gradually restored man to his true nature. Now in Christianity we see the final stage. Here is the perfect polity and the perfect kingdom, the image of the heavenly Jerusalem and of the kingdom of God. In this perfect polity and kingdom, all the parts fall into place.

* * * *

Eusebius' discussion of kingdom and polity makes plain his two most general assumptions about the Christian society. In the first place he assumes that the Christian society on earth is to be an image of the kingdom and polity of heaven. In the second place he assumes that the Christian society on earth is a unity embracing all aspects of civilization and that in this unity the function of the emperor, for example, is as Christian as that of the bishop. The whole of human society should be Christian and holy, and it becomes Christian and holy when it is an image of heaven.

A brief statement of two Western positions, one patristic and one late medieval, may throw some light on the significance of these assumptions for the idea of the Christian society. In the patristic period, St. Augustine denies the two assumptions of Eusebius and argues that the Christian society on earth is neither a unity in itself nor an image in relation to heaven. In the late medieval period, Nicholas of Cusa accepts Eusebius' assumptions on unity and image, but a different theology generates a new kind of unity and a new kind of image.

[81] In Isaiam I, 27 (PG XXIV, 100B).

To St. Augustine, the Christian society on earth is a mixture of *two* cities or polities or kingdoms, the earthly city and the city of God, and neither is an image of the heavenly Jerusalem. The earthly city in itself, whether Babylon or Rome, is a perversion of the natural order, and as such can make no claim to be an image of the city or kingdom of heaven. But if the earthly city is less than an image, the pilgrim city of God is more than a mere image of the heavenly Jerusalem. Even though it exists here on earth only by faith, nevertheless it *is* the city of God.

Nicholas of Cusa [82] agrees with Eusebius on the Christian unity of society and often discusses this society in terms of image, but his conclusions differ radically from those of Eusebius. To understand the differences we must look beyond the Christian society to the theologies which justify it. Eusebius thinks in terms of a succession of images which begins within the Trinity itself; there are stages of descent rather than any absolute break. God the Father, unknowable and beyond form, is perfectly imaged in Christ; through Christ the image passes to the heavenly kingdom; and finally it appears in the Christian society on earth. Cusanus, on the other hand, has no succession of images within the Trinity, and in place of stages of descent he emphasizes the absolute break and disproportion between the Trinity and all creation.

Since Nicholas of Cusa abandons Eusebius' theology of images, he must also, in his social thought, abandon the universal monarchical solution which that theology justifies. Cusanus maintains that the Christian society must image the whole Trinity, not any single pattern which is variously present in Father, Logos, and kingdom of heaven. In consequence the Christian society cannot be defined by any single governmental pattern such as monarchy. A society is Christian because of the dynamic unity of its members in concord, consent and freedom. All concord is ultimately derived

[82] The following remarks on Nicholas of Cusa do no more than pick out one aspect of his thought. For a general treatment, cf. K. Vorländer, Geschichte der Philosophie (9th ed. by E. Metzke, Hamburg, 1949), Vol. I, pp. 390–412; J. Ritter, "Die Stellung des Nicolaus von Cues in der Philosophiegeschichte," Blätter für deutsche Philosophie XIII (1939), pp. 111–155. On his social thought cf. E. Bohnenstädt, Kirche und Reich im Schrifttum des Nikolaus von Cues (Sitzungsberichte, Heidelberg, Phil.-hist. Kl., Jahrg., 1938–39, Abh. I) Heidelberg, 1939; G. Kallen "Die politische Theorie im philosophischem System des Nikolaus von Cues," Historische Zeitschrift CLXV (1941–42), pp. 246–277.

from the most concordant Trinity, but concord may exist within many governmental forms.[83] And a similar modification of Eusebius' position follows from Cusanus' emphasis on the absolute disproportion and break between the Trinity and all creation. Where Eusebius has a universal solution in terms of one kingly animal and of one godly polity, Nicholas of Cusa must argue that only a multiplicity of images, in men and societies, can suggest the full reality of a Trinity which is ultimately beyond all image.[84]

If we look only at the social aspect, the three solutions under discussion may provisionally be classified in terms of their differing relations to Greco-Roman society. Eusebius optimistically attempts a Christian interpretation and completion of it. Augustine somewhat pessimistically accepts it, not as the true Christian order, but as the divinely ordained social structure of a sinful world where the city of God can exist only by faith. And Nicholas of Cusa, from the standpoint of medieval optimism, undertakes a total Christian transformation and reconstruction of it.

The comparison with St. Augustine and Nicholas of Cusa throws into clearer relief Eusebius' idea of the Christian society, but it also shows that this idea of the Christian society is fully understandable only in terms of other aspects of his thought. At this point the problem of Eusebius' place in the tradition of the Christian society passes over into the problem, beyond the scope of this paper, of his place in the Christian tradition as a whole. Why does Eusebius find the Roman Empire to be essentially Christian and to image the kingdom of God, while Augustine relates the same Empire to the realm of Babylon? Why does the Christian experience of Eusebius lead to the one universal solution of the problem of society, while the Christian experience of Nicholas of Cusa affirms and justifies a multiplicity of solutions? Only when these questions have been answered will we be able to see Eusebius in his full historical context.

[83] The main evidence will be found in the De Concordantia Catholica, in the Opera Omnia (Basel, 1565), p. 685f. Books I and II only have been edited in the critical edition of the Opera Omnia (Leipzig, 1932–), Vol. XIV (1939–).

[84] E.g. the Idiota, ed. L. Baur (Opera Omnia, Leipzig, Vol. V); De Visione Dei (Opera Omnia, Basel, p. 181f.); De Pace Fidei (ibid., p. 862f.).

A NOTE ON LUKE II 49

Οὐκ ἤδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με;

Several recent translators of the New Testament prefer the rendering, *in my Father's house*, to the alternative, *in the things of my Father, about my Father's business*. They have very early precedent for this, in Tatian's Diatessaron and the Syriac versions.

Within the Greek tradition, Didymus of Alexandria (d. 398)[1] and the author of the dialogue *De Spiritu Sancto*[2] — who may be Theodoret of Cyrrhus (ca. 393–458) — quote St. Luke with the very words, ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Πατρός μου, in place of our reading, which is that of all the codices. One suspects that these writers, and Tatian, drew upon St. John: Μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου.[3] At any rate, they leave no doubt about their understanding of St. Luke.

By an inverse substitution, St. Irenaeus, reporting the doctrine of "the elders" on grades of beatitude, quotes them as saying: διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν κύριον, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου μονὰς εἶναι πολλάς.[4] Here it is St. Luke's expression, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου, which replaces St. John's, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου. This carries the exegetical tradition of their equivalence back very far, probably even to Papias, or to his generation.[5]

Without departing from the genuine text of St. Luke, Origen,[6] Epiphanius[7] and Cyril of Alexandria[8] also understand it as meaning the temple at Jerusalem; and they use it against various heretics to prove that the God of the temple and the Father of Jesus are one.

The alternative sense, *in the things of my Father*, has by no means been dislodged. Protest against tolerating a doubt about it was registered by the late Professor John A. Scott, in his review of the Revised

[1] De Trinitate III, xx (PG XXXIX, 895).

[2] xix (J. L. Schulze, Theodoreti Opera Omnia V, 1063; Athanasii inter dubia, PG XXVIII, 1324).

[3] ii, 16.

[4] Adv. Haer. V, xxxvi, 1 (W. W. Harvey, II, 428). John xiv, 2.

[5] See R. M. Grant, "Papias and the Gospels," Anglican Theological Review XXV (1943), 220. This article and one by Wifstrand, mentioned below, were brought to my attention by Professor Nock, to whom I am much indebted.

[6] In Lucam, hom. XVIII (Max Rauer, Origenes Werke IX = CB XXXV, 125, 1–5); hom. XX (Rauer, 132, 1–4). Origen makes independent use of the idiom, Adv. Celsum VIII, lvi (P. Koetschau, Origenes Werke II = CB III, 272, 20): ἐν τοῖς τοῦ κτίσαντος ἡμᾶς, *in the world of our Creator*. On this, see A. Wifstrand, "Die Wahre Lehre des Kelsos," Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1941–1942, p. 430.

[7] Heresy LXVI, xlii, 12 (Karl Holl, Epiphanius III = CB XXXVII, 80, 7–8).

[8] In Lucam, comment. ad ii, 49 (Angelo Mai, Patrum Nova Bibliotheca II, 138: PG LXXII, 509).

Standard Edition of the New Testament.[9] The Greek expression, he writes, "can mean only 'in the affairs of my Father' or 'things of my Father.' Exactly parallel is Luke xx, 25: 'Give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.' " [10]

In a reply to the review, Professor Henry J. Cadbury made appropriate comment on this point.[11] The Greek of itself is indeterminate. The example cited by Professor Scott supports his way of taking it; but there is support also for the other way, for example in Lysias, the Septuagint, Josephus, the papyri.[12] All of these have illustrations of the type *τά τινος*, meaning *somebody's house*. In favor of this use in the Lucan context, Professor Cadbury notes that the question in the minds of Mary and Joseph, in their search, may well have been, "Where is our boy?", rather than "What is he doing?"

Precisely the matter-of-factness of this sense, *in my Father's house*, may stir misgiving. If that is all the child meant to say, how could the evangelist write: "They did not understand the word which he spoke to them"? Origen felt this difficulty, and suggested, as might have been expected of Origen, that under the plain meaning lay another one — *μυστήριον αἰνίττεται*.[13] It is not necessary, however, to resort to allegory. Mary's spoken question, "Child, why hast thou done so to us?", remained unanswered; and that mystery must have cast a lasting shadow in her heart. Its resolution would not have depended on either answer to our dilemma.

The present note brings nothing decisive to the discussion, and nothing new except another parallel, a striking one. St. John Chrysostom, having found in his exile a temporary resting place, wrote a letter to the Lady Olympias to deter his friends in Constantinople from action that would force him to move again. "My Lord Dioscoros," he writes from Cucusus, "chanced to be here; and he even dispatched a servant to Caesarea for this very object, begging and beseeching me not to pass over his house (*τῆς αὐτοῦ οἰκίας*) for another. Many others did so too; but I thought I had to give him the preference; *καὶ κατήχθημεν ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ*: and we turned in to lodge with him." [14]

[9] Classical Weekly XL (1947), 68–71.

[10] This general use is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament. E.g., Philippians ii, 21: *Οἱ πάντες γὰρ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ζητοῦσιν, οὐ τὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. See below, note 12.

[11] Classical Weekly XLI, 92–94.

[12] Due references for *τά τινος* expressions are found in abundance in the New Testament lexicons. See both Bauer and Zorell, also LSJ, under *ὁ, ἡ, τό*. Wifstrand, as above, footnote 6, cites excellent material.

[13] In Lucam, hom. xx (Rauer, 132, 4–7).

[14] Ad Olympiadem, epist. XIII (Ben.[2] III, 713 B: PG LII, 610 seq.).

Ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ, *in his house,* needs no antecedent; but it has one: τῆς αὐτοῦ οἰκίας. The same might be said of the words of Jesus, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου. The scene is context enough; but a verbal antecedent is not far to seek: ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.[15]

Edgar R. Smothers, S.J.

St. Joseph's Mercy Hospital
Ann Arbor, Michigan

[15] Luke ii, 46.

MT. 5.43: 'HATE THINE ENEMY'

Mt. 5.43, which reads, 'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy,' has long puzzled historians of Judaism. Strack-Billerbeck (ad loc.) profess themselves unable to find a written source for the second half of the maxim quoted, and think it is to be explained as a popular saying based on II Sam. 19.7 (so the Hebrew; English, 6) where Joab rebukes David for loving those who hate him and hating those who love him. This is not quite satisfactory, however, for all the five other maxims quoted in the chapter (and introduced by the same or almost the same formula) are either verbal quotations or close verbal reminiscences of verses of the Mosaic Law. (Mt. 5.33, parallel to Num. 30.3, is, of the five, the one most remote from its presumptive original.) Therefore it has been suggested, e.g., that the second half of the maxim in 43 was not intended to be a part of the quotation, but was a bit of exegesis, added by Jesus or by some Christian editor, to indicate the popular understanding of 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor' (Lev. 19.18).

Such a remedy, however, seems more difficult than the difficulty. It is therefore interesting to notice, in the new material from the Dead Sea Scrolls, now published by Sukenik,[1] a passage which can be translated approximately as follows:

> 'To do that which is good and upright before Him, according as He commanded by the hand of Moses and by the hand of all His servants the prophets, and to love whatsoever He chooses and to hate whatsoever He despises, to withdraw from all evil and to adhere to all good works and to do truth and mercy and judgment in the land and to walk no longer in the hardness of a guilty heart and of eyes that go a whoreing to do all manner of evil, but to bring every man, whose heart maketh him willing, to do the laws of God in the covenant of mercy, to be united in the counsel of God and to walk before him perfect (according to) all the things revealed unto their lawful assemblies, *and to love all the children of light, each man according to his lot, in the counsel of God, and to hate all the children of darkness, each man according to his guilt, in the vengeance of God.*'

From such scraps of context as are preserved it seems likely that this may be the conclusion of an oath, and a similar clause ('that he will for ever hate the unjust and fight the battle of the just') is found in the

[1] E. L. Sukenik, Megillot Genuzot II, Jerusalem N.D. (1950), pp. 28–29.

oath of the Essenes as given in Josephus, War, II, 139 (though many striking clauses of the latter oath are not paralleled in this fragment of the DSS). At any rate, there is no doubt that this fragment represents the authoritative teaching of the sect, the sort of *legal* material which the author of Mt. 5 was concerned to criticize.

Needless to say, this note is not intended to imply that the author of Mt. 5 (to say nothing of Jesus) actually was criticizing the teaching of the sect which produced the DSS (let alone this passage of this particular work). The actual source of the quotation in Mt. 5.43 is perhaps best indicated by the word 'heard' in the expression which introduces it, 'You have *heard* that it was said.' That is to say, both Jesus and his audience probably derived most of their knowledge of the Old Testament from hearing it read in services. Though some of them (and certainly Jesus himself, if we are to believe Luke 4.16 ff.) were themselves able to read it, yet they were hardly of the manuscript-owning class, their own reading (like the first literature they produced) was a thing of shreds and patches, and their notion of the content of the Old Testament was formed largely from those parts of it which were most used in synagogue, but above all from the targums of those parts. The existence of Mt. 5.43 makes it probable that a targum used in Galilee in Jesus' day glossed the words, 'thou shalt love thy neighbor' with the words, 'and hate thine enemy.'

An example of such a gloss is found in the following italicized words from the present text of the Jerusalem Targum to the same verse: 'And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; *that which is hateful to thee, do not unto him.*' Neither the Jerusalem Targum, however, nor the Onkelos, preserves any trace of the gloss which probably underlay the words in Mt. That the exegesis contained in those words is not incompatible, nevertheless, with the spirit even of orthodox Judaism, is shown by the fact that it is in substantial agreement with the comment of Maimonides on the same verse: 'He is thy neighbor if he is good, but not if he is wicked, as is written (Prov. 8.13), The fear of the Lord is to hate evil.' A similar comment is found in Midrash Haggadol to the same verse, and both are doubtless based on a longer, but textually uncertain, passage to the same effect at the end of ch. 16 of Abot de R. Nathan. (Similar, also, in thought, but not verbally connected, is the comment on the first half of the same verse — Lev. 19.18 — in Sifra and in Bereshit Rabba 55.3.)

However, though in the present state of the study, and in the light of such various parallels, it can neither be asserted nor denied that there was any direct connection between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospels,

yet it should at least be noted that the DSS are rich in striking parallels to early Christian texts. Consider, for example, this passage: [2]

> 'What is flesh (that it should deserve) such (mercies), and what is a creature of clay that (God) should multiply (His) wonders (upon him)? [3] For he is in iniquity from the womb,[4] and unto eld in the guilt of sacrilege. I know, moreover, that no man can be just [5] and none can walk perfect in the way; all works of justice are of God Most High and the way of man cannot be blameless unless (he walk) in the spirit [6] which God shaped for him, to make perfect a way for the children of men, that they might know all His works [7] in the power of His might [8] and the multitude of His mercies upon all the children of His good pleasure.' [9]

Morton Smith

Brown University

[2] Translated from Sukenik, op. cit., pp. 47–48 (towards the end of ch. IV of the psalm book).
[3] II Cor. 4.7.
[4] Romans 9.11ff.
[5] Romans 3.9.
[6] Romans 8.4f.
[7] I Cor. 2.12.
[8] Ephesians 1.19.
[9] Romans 9.8 ff.

THE NICOLAS BERDYAEV SOCIETY

A group of the friends of Nicolas Berdyaev, who died in March, 1948, have organized in Paris The Nicolas Berdyaev Society in order to extend his thought and his teaching. They propose to found a Museum in his home in Clamart, to organize lectures, publish relevant literature and eventually to offer scholarships for study. Further information may be obtained from Dr. Donald A. Lowrie, 29 Rue Saint-Didier, Paris (16).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Offersang og Sangoffer. *By Sigmund Mowinckel.* Oslo, Aschehoug, 1951. xv, 664 p.

Les Sacrements dans l'Evangile Johannique. La vie de Jésus et le culte de l'église primitive. *Par Oscar Cullamnn.* Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1951. 92 p. 400 fr.

On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith. *By Hugh of Saint Victor.* English version by Roy J. Defarrari. Cambridge, Mass., The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1951. xx, 486 p. $5.00.

Types of Religious Experience Christian and Non-Christian. *By Joachim Wach.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, [1951]. xvi, 195 p. $3.50.

Melilah. *Edited by Edward Robertson and Meir Wallenstein.* [Manchester, England], Manchester University Press, 1950. 344 p. 30/. (In Hebrew.)

The Ecumenical Movement. *By Rev. Leonard Hodgson.* Sewanee, University of the South, 1951. 50 p.

Mystique de Jesus Chez Origene. *Par Frédéric Bertrand.* Paris, Aubier, 1951. 157 p.

Studien zur Epiklese der Römischen Taufwasserweihe. *Von Eduard Stommel.* Bonn, Hanstein, 1950. 112 p.

L'Evangile des Voyages de Jesus ou la Section 9, 51–18, 14 De Saint Luc. *Par le Chanoine Louis Girard.* Paris, Gabalda, 1951. 130 p.

Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker. *Von Joachim Bieneck.* Zürich, Zwingli, 1951. 90 p. Fr. 6.25.

Les Psaumes. *Par J. Steinmann.* Paris, Gabalda, 1951. 186 p.

Opera Omnia Johannes Duns Scoti. *By Duns Scotus.* Civitas Vaticana, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1951. Variously paged.

Jeremie. Les Lamentations. Baruch. *Traduits par A. Gelin.* La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'Ecole Biblique de Jérusalem. Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1951. 309 p. 960 fr.

La Genese. *Traduite par R. de Vaux.* La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'Ecole Biblique de Jérusalem. Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1951. 219 p. 690 fr.

The Epic of St. Vardan the Brave. An abridged translation of the history of Vardan and the war of the Armenians. *By the Vardapet Yeghisheh (Elisha).* N. Y., Diocese of the Armenian Church in North America, 1951. 108 p. $1.50.

Bibliografia Degli Scritti di Ernesto Buonaiuti a Cura di Marcella Ravà. Prefazione *di Luigi Salvatorelli.* Firenze, La Nuova Italia, 1951. xxvi, 226 p. L. 1800.

L'Argument de Tradition dans la Controverse Eucharistique entre Catholiques et Reformes Francais au XVII[e] Sciecle. *Par Remi Snoeks.* Gembloux, Duculot, 1951. xlvii, 560 p.

"Those Who Are Baptized for the Dead." I Cor. 15:29. An Exegetical Historical Dissertation. *By Fr. Bernard Foschini,* Worcester, Mass., The Heffernan Press, 1951. viii, 101 p.

Les Principaux Manuscrits de Chant Gregorien, Ambrosien, Mozarabe, Gallican. *Publiés en fac-similés phototypiques sous la direction de Dom Joseph Gajard* [Dans] Paleographie Musicale, Juillet 1951–Octobre 1951. Tournai, Desclée, pp. 89–104, plates.

Evidence and Its Function According to John Duns Scotus. *By Peter C. Vier.* St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1951. xi, 174 p.

L'Attività Della Santa Sede Nel 1950. [Libreria Vaticana, 1951] 704 p. L 2000.

Rabbinic Essays. *By Jacob Z. Lauterbach.* Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1951. xv, 570 p.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Rome, American Academy, 1951. Volume XX.

L'Activite du Saint-Siege en 1950. Imprimerie Polygotte du Vatican. 558 p.

Le Paradis Spirituel et Autres Textes Annexes. *Par Nicétas Stéthatos.* Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1943. 100 p.